07.02-12/30/96-00890

Revised: December 30, 1996

FINAL

1997-1998 SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

CONTRACT TASK ORDER 0351

DECEMBER 31, 1996

Prepared for:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY ATLANTIC DIVISION NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND Norfolk, Virginia

Under:

LANTDIV CLEAN Program Contract N62470-89-D-4814

Prepared by:

BAKER ENVIRONMENTAL, INC. Coraopolis, Pennsylvania

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page
IN	TRODUCT	ION	. 1-1
1.1		Description	
1.2		nmental Status/Previous Investigations and Reporting	
1.2	1.2.1	Initial Assessment Study	
	1.2.2	Confirmation Study	
	1.2.3	Site 21 Site Investigation	
-	1.2.4	Focused Biological Sampling and Preliminary Risk Evaluation	
	1.2.5	Round One RI	
	1.2.6	Round Two RIs/SSA Investigations	. 1-5
	1.2.7	Reporting	. 1-6
1.3		Organization	. 1-9
	-		
SI		A DESCRIPTIONS	
2.1		scriptions	
	2.1.1	Site 1 - Dudley Road Landfill	
	2.1.2	Site 2 - Turkey Road Landfill	
	2.1.3	Site 3 - Group 16 Magazine Landfill	
	2.1.4	Site 4 - Burning Pad Residue Landfill	
	2.1.5	Site 5 - Surplus Transformer Storage Area	. 2-3
	2.1.6	Site 6 - Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Impoundment	. 2-3
	2.1.7	Site 7 - Plant 3 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge	
		Area	. 2-4
	2.1.8	Site 8 - NEDED Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge	
		Area	. 2-4
	2.1.9	Site 9 - Plant 1 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge	
		Area	. 2-5
	2.1.10	Site 11 - Abandoned Explosives Burning Pits	
	2.1.11	Site 12 - Barracks Road Landfill	
		Site 16 - West Road Landfill	
		Site 17 - Holm Road Landfill	
		Site 18 - Building 476 Discharge Area	
		Site 19 - Conveyor Belt Soils at Building 10	
		Site 21 - Battery and Drum Disposal Area	
		Site 22 - Burn Pad	
	2.1.17		
		Site 24 - Aviation Field	
		Site 25 - Building 373 Rocket Plant	
	2.1.20	Site 26 - Building 1816 Mark 48 Waste Otto Fuel Tank	
2.2		creening Area Descriptions	
۷.,	2.2.1	Site Screening Area 2 - Former EOD Burning/Disposal Area	2-11
	2.2.1	Site Screening Area 3 - Fire Training Pits and Vicinity	2-11
	2.2.2	Site Screening Area 4 - Weapons Casing/Drum Disposal Area	
	2.2.3 2.2.4	Site Screening Area 5 - Bypass Road Landfill	
	2.2.4	Site Screening Area 8 - Building 350 Rail Roundhouse Maintenance	
	۷.۷.۶	Area Trench Outfall	
		MIDA HURAN MUMAN ARRAMAN ARRAM	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

				Page
		2.2.6	Site Screening Area 9 - Building 1751 Chemistry Laboratory	
		2.2.7	Neutralization Unit and Drainage Area	2-13
		2.2.1	Field	2-13
		2.2.8	Site Screening Area 11 - Building 3 Neutralization Unit	2-13
		2.2.9	Site Screening Area 12 - Public Works Storage Yard/Building 683 Vicinity	
		2.2.10	Site Screening Area 13 - Building 529 Battery Drainage Area	2-14
		2.2.11	Site Screening Area 14 - Building 537 Discharge to Felgates	
		2.2.1	Creek	2-15
		2.2.12	Site Screening Area 15 - Sewage Treatment Plant #1/Sludge	
			Drying Beds and Discharge Area	2-15
		2.2.13	Site Screening Area 16 - Building 402 Metal Disposal Area and	
			Environs	2-16
		2.2.14	Site Screening Area 17 - Building 1456 Mark 46 Waste Otto Fuel	
			Tank	2-16
		2.2.15		2 17
			Area and Environs	2-17
		2.2.16	Site Screening Area 20 - Lee Pond	2-17
		2.2.17	Site Screening Area 22 - Sand Blasting Grit Pile	2-18
		2.2.19		2-18
		2.2.19		2-19
		2.2.20	Site Selecting 1 near 2	
3.0	CERC	LA PR	OCESS ACTIVITIES	. 3-1
	3.1	RI/FS	Process	. 3-1
	3.2	Remov	val Actions	. 3-2
	3.3	Interin	n (Early) Remedial Actions	3-3
	3.4	Presun	nptive Remedies	3-3
	3.5	Treata	bility Studies	3-4
4.0	DET A	TITTE	RISK SITE EVALUATION	4-1
4.0	4.1	Relativ	ve Risk Ranking	4-1
	1+4	4.1.1	Contaminant Hazard Factor	4-2
		4.1.2	Migration Pathway Factor	4-2
		4.1.3	Receptor Factor	4-3
	4.2	Relati	ve Risk Ranking Results	4-3
	4.3	Site ar	nd SSA Prioritization	4-4
5.0	CITTI	MANA	GEMENT PLAN SCHEDULES	5-1
5.0	5.1	Sched	uling Assumptions	5-1
	J. 1	5.1.1		5-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

			<u>Pag</u>	<u>şe</u>	
		5.1.2	Document Preparation, Field Investigation, and Sample Analysis/Validation Assumptions	-2	
	5.2	Site M	lanagement Plan Schedules 5-		
		5.2.1	Proposed Removal Actions 5-		
		5.2.2	RI/FS and RD/RA Schedules 5-	.4	
		5.2.3	Treatability Study Schedule 5-	.4	
		5.2.4	Presumptive Remedies 5-	.6	
6.0	REFE	RENCI	ES 6-	-1	
			LIST OF APPENDICES		
Α	Site Ra	anking F	Process and Results		
	A-1	_	itative Site Ranking Process and Results FY 1993 - FY 1995		
	A-2	Relativ	ve Risk Ranking FY 1996 - Present		
В	Detaile	ed Actua	al Schedules for Completed Actions (Removal Actions and Finalized		
	Report	•			
C			dules for Removal Actions		
D			dules for Investigative Work: FY 1995		
E	Detailed Schedules for Investigative Work: FY 1996				
F			dules for Investigative Work: FY 1997		
G	Detaile	ed Sched	dules for Investigative Work: FY 1998 and Beyond		
			LIST OF TABLES		
Numbe	<u>er</u>		LIST OF TABLES		
2-1	Sites a	and Site	Screening Areas		
4-1	Sites a	and Cor	responding Rank Derived Using Relative Risk Ranking		
4-2	SSAs	and Cor	responding Rank Derived Using Relative Risk Ranking		
5-1	Prima	ry and S	Secondary Documents as Defined in the FFA		
5-2		•	Secondary Document Review Process		
5-3		Estimated Work Plan and Field Investigation Durations for Sites and SSAs			
5-4			eparation Durations		
5-5	Prima	rv and S	Secondary Deliverables by Month		

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Numb</u>	<u>per</u>
1-1	Location of Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia
2-1	Location and Approximate Sizes of Planned Areas of Investigation (Sites and SSAs)
3-1	RI/FS Process
3-2	Key Decision Points During the Site Screening Process
3-3	Non-Time Critical Removal Action Process
3-4	Interim Remedial Action Process
5-1	Overall Schedule for Activities Conducted at WPNSTA
5-2	Projected Schedules and Deliverable Dates for FV 1997 - 1998

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AOC Area of Concern

AST Aboveground Storage Tank
AWQC Ambient Water Quality Criteria

Baker Environmental, Inc.

CERCLA Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability

Act

CHF Contaminant Hazard Factor

DOD Department of Defense

EE/CA Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis

EOD Explosives Ordnance Disposal

EPIC Environmental Photographic Interpretation Center

FFA Federal Facility Agreement

FY Fiscal Year

HRSD Hampton Roads Sanitation District

IAS Initial Assessment Study

IRP Installation Restoration Program

LOEL Lowest Observed Effect Level

MPF Migration Pathway Factor

NEDED Naval Explosives Development Engineering Department

NEESA Naval Energy and Environmental Support Activity
NOAA National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPDES National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

NPL National Priorities List

OU Operable Unit

PAH Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons

PCB Polychlorinated Biphenyl
PRAP Proposed Remedial Action Plan
PRG Preliminary Remediation Goal

PW Public Works

RA Remedial Action

RCRA Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

RD Remedial Design RF Receptor Factor

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Continued)

RI Remedial Investigation

RI/FS Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study

ROD Record of Decision
RRR Relative Risk Ranking

SI Site Investigation
SMP Site Management Plan
SSA Site Screening Area
SSP Site Screening Process
STP Sewage Treatment Plant

SWMU Solid Waste Management Unit

TNT Trinitrotoluene

TRC Technical Review Committee

USEPA United States Environmental Protection Agency

UST Underground Storage Tank

WES Waterways Experimental Station

WPNSTA Yorktown Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the Site Management Plan (SMP) for Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia (WPNSTA Yorktown). As part of the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA, USEPA, 1994b), the SMP is required as the management tool for planning, reviewing, and setting priorities for all remedial response activities to be conducted at the facility. The SMP is updated annually to revise priorities of activities as work progresses and additional information becomes available. This SMP presents the rationale for the sequence of future investigation and remediation activities to be completed and the estimated schedule for completion of these activities, with detailed schedules and deadlines presented for Fiscal Years (FY) 1997 and 1998, as required by the FFA. The use of an SMP allows for annual adjustment in scheduled activities for reasons such as Federal budgetary constraints, changes in scope of investigation/remediation activities or other unanticipated events without modifying the FFA.

Section XII of the FFA requires that the SMP include the detailed scheduling of activities for two fiscal years, annual updating of the scheduled activities, and review and approval by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Region III and the Commonwealth of Virginia. As part of the FFA development and by mutual consent of the Navy and the USEPA, several Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs) have been included for investigation and evaluation under the FFA. There are 15 former SWMUs, two areas identified in the Environmental Photographic Interpretation Center (EPIC) study, one area of concern (AOC), and one former Installation Restoration Program (IRP) site to be investigated. These 19 areas have been termed Site Screening Areas (SSAs) and are listed in Appendix A of the FFA. Also, two AOCs (which have been designated SSAs), two SSAs, and one site have been added for investigation and evaluation which were not included in the FFA, and based on the results of the site screening process (SSP), four SSAs have been retained as sites for additional Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) efforts. Scheduled activities for the 21 sites and 19 SSAs are presented in this SMP.

1.1 Facility Description

WPNSTA Yorktown is a 10,624 acre installation located on the Virginia Peninsula in York and James City Counties and the City of Newport News (Figure 1-1). The installation is bounded on the northwest by the Naval Supply Center Cheatham Annex, the Virginia Emergency Fuel Farm, and the future community development of Whittaker's Mill; on the northeast by the York River and the

Colonial National Historic Parkway; on the southwest by Route 143 and Interstate 64; and on the southeast by Route 238 and the community of Lackey.

WPNSTA Yorktown, originally named the U.S. Mine Depot, was established in 1918 to support the laying of mines in the North Sea during World War I. The establishment of the depot was the culmination of a search process, begun in 1917 at the request of Congress, to locate an Atlantic coast site for a weapons handling and storage facility. For 20 years after World War I, the depot received, reclaimed, stored, and issued mines, depth charges, and related materials. During World War II, the facility was expanded to include three additional trinitrotoluene (TNT) loading plants and new torpedo overhaul facilities. A research and development laboratory for experimentation with high explosives was established in 1944. In 1947, a quality evaluation laboratory was developed to monitor special tasks assigned to the facility, which included the design and development of depth charges and advanced underwater weapons. On August 7, 1959, the U.S. Mine Depot was redesignated the U.S. Naval Weapons Station. The primary mission of WPNSTA Yorktown is to provide ordnance, technical support, and related services to sustain the war-fighting capability of the armed forces in support of national military strategy. The long-term plans for the facility are the same as the present plans, with land use also generally the same as at present (Department of the Navy, 1991).

1.2 Environmental Status/Previous Investigations and Reporting

The environmental condition of WPNSTA Yorktown is being investigated through the Department of Defense's IRP. On October 15, 1992, WPNSTA Yorktown was included on the National Priorities List (NPL) primarily due to the facility's proximity to wetlands and the potential impact on the surrounding environment.

Previous investigation reports completed through the IRP include an Initial Assessment Study (IAS) (July 1984), two Confirmation Study Reports (June 1986 and June 1988), a Remedial Investigation (RI) Interim Report (July 1991), a Site 21 Site Inspection Report (February 1992), a Focused Biological Sampling and Risk Evaluation Report (April 1993), and a Round One RI Report (July 1993). The following paragraphs briefly describe the most important previous investigations conducted at WPNSTA Yorktown.

1.2.1 Initial Assessment Study

The purpose of the IAS (C. C. Johnson & Associates, Inc. and CH2M Hill, July 1984) was to identify and assess sites posing a potential threat to human health and/or the environment due to contamination from past operations. A total of 19 potentially contaminated sites was identified based on information from historical records, aerial photographs, field inspections, and personnel interviews. Each site was evaluated for the type of contamination, migration pathways, and pollutant receptors. The IAS concluded that 15 of the 19 sites were of sufficient threat to human health or the environment to warrant Confirmation Studies.

1.2.2 Confirmation Study

Two rounds of data were obtained during the Confirmation Study. During the first round of sampling, conducted in the winter of 1986, environmental samples were collected from the 15 sites identified in the IAS. This effort was documented in the "Confirmation Study Step IA (Verification), Round One," (Dames & Moore, June 1986). The initial sampling effort included:

- Installation and sampling of 26 monitoring wells
- Collection of 21 surface water and sediment samples
- Collection of 26 surface soil samples
- Chemical analysis of the samples collected

The second round of sampling was conducted during November and December 1987. The Round Two effort included:

- Collection of 26 groundwater samples from the previously installed wells
- Collection of 26 surface water and 32 sediment samples
- Collection of 12 surface soil samples
- Chemical analysis of the samples collected

The results of the analyses and comparisons with appropriate regulatory standards were presented in the "Confirmation Study Step IA (Verification), Round Two," (Dames & Moore, June 1988). The results of these field efforts were combined and summarized in the Draft RI Interim Report

(Dames & Moore, February 1989). This report was subsequently revised by Versar in 1991 to incorporate comments from the Technical Review Committee (TRC); this report is referred to as the RI Interim Report. The RI Interim Report recommended that further RI activities be completed at 14 of the 15 sites for which data were available.

1.2.3 Site 21 Site Investigation

In November 1990, WPNSTA Yorktown personnel identified an additional site (Site 21, the Battery and Drum Disposal Area) that had not been included in the previous investigations. A Site Investigation (SI) at Site 21 was conducted in October 1991. Three monitoring wells were installed and sampled, and surface and subsurface soil samples were collected. The results of this investigation were presented in the "Draft Final Site Inspection Report, Site 21-Battery and Drum Disposal Area, Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia" (Baker/Weston, February 1992).

1.2.4 Focused Biological Sampling and Preliminary Risk Evaluation

The Focused Biological Sampling and Preliminary Risk Evaluation Report (Baker/Weston, April 1993b) summarized the results of a limited biological tissue, surface water, and sediment sampling effort conducted in October 1992. The primary object of the sampling program was to evaluate the potential human health risk associated with consumption of fish and shellfish taken from select waters within WPNSTA Yorktown.

1.2.5 Round One RI

The RI Interim Report recommended that 14 of the 15 sites be included for further study. However, based on evaluation of the available data, all 15 sites were recommended for further study during the Round One RI. In addition, based on the data obtained from the SI at Site 21, this site also was included in the Round One study (Baker/Weston, July 1993a).

The Round One RI sampling effort included:

Geophysical investigations

- Biota investigations
- Tidal investigations
- Aquifer testing
- Monitoring well installation (23 wells)
- Collection of 51 groundwater samples (22 new wells, 29 existing wells; one newly installed well was dry)
- Collection of 196 surface water and sediment samples
- Collection of 115 surface soil samples
- Collection of 48 subsurface soil samples
- Chemical analysis of the samples collected

The results of the Round One RI indicated that further investigation was needed at all of the 16 sites, with the exception of Site 5, to better define the nature and/or extent of contamination associated with each site. A No Action Record of Decision (ROD) was finalized in September, 1994 for Site 5.

1.2.6 Round Two RIs/SSA Investigations

The Round Two RI field investigation was conducted for: (1) Sites 6, 7, 12, 16 and SSA 16 and Background for the York River Drainage Area in 1994; (2) Sites 9 and 19 in 1995 to supplement the Round One RI; (3) and Sites 1, 3, 4, 11, 17, 21, and 22 in 1996 to supplement the Round One RI. Additional soil, subsurface soil, surface water, sediment and groundwater samples and biota were collected.

In addition to the Round Two RI, SSAs 1, 3, 6, 7, 12, and 15 were investigated during 1994. Environmental media including surface soil, subsurface soil, groundwater, surface water, and sediment were investigated at those SSAs having potential impacts to these media. SSAs 2, 17, 18, and 19 were investigated in early 1995 and SSAs 8, 11, 12, and 13 were investigated in early 1996. Again, surface soil, subsurface soil, groundwater, surface water and sediment were investigated where applicable.

1-5

Based on the results of the SSP, SSAs 1, 6, 7, and 18 will be retained as Sites 23, 24, 25, and 26, respectively for additional RI/FS efforts. These SSAs posed unacceptable human health and/or ecological risk as a result of risk screening.

SSAs 17 and 19 have been removed from the RI/FS process because the SSAs did not pose unacceptable human health or ecological risk as a result of risk screening. Long-term monitoring at SSA 2 has been included in a RCRA Part B Permit Application. SSA 15 was combined with another investigation area (Site 12).

1.2.7 Reporting

Subsequent to the field investigations, RI Reports and SSP Reports were generated for sites and SSAs. The following reports have been submitted in Draft form to USEPA Region III and the Commonwealth of Virginia:

RI Reports

- Sites 1 and 3
- Sites 6 and 7
- Sites 9 and 19

Feasibility Studies

• Sites 9 and 19

Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP)/RODs

- Sites 1 and 3 (PRAP only)
- Sites 9 and 19 (PRAP only)
- Site 12 (ROD only)

1-6

SSP Reports

• SSAs 8, 11, 12, and 13

The following reports have been submitted in Final form to USEPA Region III and the Commonwealth of Virginia:

RI Reports

- Site 16/SSA 16
- Site 12

Feasibility Studies

• Site 12

PRAPs/RODs

- Site 5 (No Further Remedial Action)
- Site 16/SSA 16 (No Further Remedial Action with Institutional Controls)
- Site 12 (PRAP only)

SSP Reports

- SSAs 1, 6, 7, and 15
- SSAs 2, 17, 18, and 19

Miscellaneous

- Community Relations Plan
- Environmental Restoration Site Photograph Album
- Focused Biological Sampling and Preliminary Risk Evaluation Report
- Site 5 Risk Evaluation Report
- Background Literature Review Report
- York River Background Report
- WES Treatability Study Work Plan
- Sites 4 and 21 Post Removal Confirmatory Sampling Report and Baseline Risk Assessment
- Soil Assessment Report for SSA 12

Revised: December 30, 1996-

Habitat Evaluation

Installation Restoration Program Site and SSA Photograph Album

Operable Units (OUs) have been determined for the following sites:

Site 5 - OU I
Site 16/SSA 16 - OU II
Site 12 - OUs III, IV, V

Operable Unit No. I (Site 5)

A "No Action" Record of Decision for Site 5 was signed in September 1994. There are no other IRP activities associated with this site.

Operable Unit No. II (Site 16/SSA 16)

A "No Further Remedial Action with Institutional Controls" Record of Decision for Site 16/SSA 16 was signed in September 1995. There are no other IRP activities associated with this site.

Operable Unit No. III (Site 12 Area A Soil)

A soil/clay or clay equivalent CAP will be constructed on soil which exceeds the USEPA lead action level (400 mg/kg). Erosion control measures and institutional controls will be implemented. Institutional controls include water and lead use restrictions and water well placement restrictions. Limited long-term surface water monitoring of the tributary leading from Area A to Ballard Creek also will be implemented.

Operable Unit No. IV (Site 12 Areas B/C and Wood/Debris Disposal Area Soil)

A "No Action" Record of Decision for Site 12 Areas B/C and Wood/Debris Disposal Area soil will be signed in September 1996. There are no other IRP activities associated with this OU.

1-8


Operable V (Site 12 Groundwater across the Study Area and Surface Water and Sediment in Ballard Creek

Long-term groundwater monitoring as per the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP)will be implemented. The NCP includes quarterly monitoring of the groundwater and a review of the plan every 5 years. In addition, surface water and sediment within Ballard Creek will be monitored as agreed to by USEPA, VDEQ, and DoN.

1.3 Report Organization

The remainder of this report contains five sections. Section 2.0 presents a brief description of the sites and SSAs. Section 3.0 presents a summary of the procedures to be followed as part of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process that will be used at WPNSTA Yorktown. Section 4.0 presents the system used to rank the sites implementing the relative risk ranking system. Section 5.0 provides the schedules for the planned activities at the Station and the assumptions used to develop these schedules. Section 6.0 provides the references used in preparing this document.

SECTION 1.0 FIGURES



2.0 SITE AND SSA DESCRIPTIONS

This section presents a brief description of each of the current RI/FS sites and SSAs. Table 2-1 lists these areas and Figure 2-1 depicts their approximate sizes and locations.

2.1 Site Descriptions

This section describes the history of the disposal practices at each of the recently investigated RI/FS sites included in the FFA, the four newly added sites which were former SSAs, and the site which has been added for investigation and evaluation which was not included in the FFA. The information presented is from previous studies (C.C. Johnson & Associates and CH2M Hill, 1984; USEPA, December 1992a and b) and has been updated based on additional historical review and discussions with WPNSTA Yorktown personnel. The site descriptions are presented in numerical order for ease of reference.

2.1.1 Site 1 - Dudley Road Landfill

Site 1 is a 6-acre area located just north of the headwaters of Indian Field Creek. The solid waste landfill was in use from approximately 1965 to 1979 for general disposal, with one area used for disposal of plastic lens grinding waste until 1983. The solid waste landfill operated under a conditional permit (No. 287) issued by the Commonwealth of Virginia. The site was originally used for sand mining. There is an abandoned sand reclamation pit on the eastern edge of the site and a pond in the western portion of the landfill area. The water level of the pond fluctuates greatly. Seasonal ponding also occurs in the southeastern section of the site. Wastes disposed within the depression created by sand mining included asbestos insulation from steam piping; oil, grease, paint, and solvent containers; nitramine-contaminated carbon; household appliances; scrap metal banding; construction rubble; plastic lens grinding wastes; tree limbs; lumber; packaging wastes; electrical wires; and waste oil. The landfill received an estimated 255 tons of waste during the time in which the site was in use. Currently, the landfill is covered by approximately 2 feet of soil and the abandoned sand reclamation area is covered by 8 feet of soil.

2.1.2 Site 2 - Turkey Road Landfill

Site 2 is a 5-acre landfill located east of Turkey Road in a wetland area adjacent to the southern branch of Felgates Creek. Operations at the landfill reportedly began in the 1940s and ceased in 1981. Wastes disposed in this landfill include mercury and carbon-zinc batteries, tree stumps and limbs, construction rubble, missile hardware (e.g., wings, fins and power packs), electrical devices, and unidentified drums and/or tanks. Waste quantities have been estimated at 240 tons during the period of use. Hard waste material (mine casings) was primarily located along the tributaries to the southern branch of Felgates Creek. A removal of hard waste material was conducted during the summer of 1994 at Site 2.

2.1.3 Site 3 - Group 16 Magazine Landfill

Site 3 is a 2-acre area located behind the Group 16 magazines, just south of Site 1 (separated from Site 1 by a ravine), along the headwaters of Indian Field Creek. The landfill is named for its proximity to the Group 16 Magazines. The history of this landfill is unrelated to the operations at the magazines. The landfill area was reportedly in use from 1940 to 1970 and received an estimated 90 tons of waste during the time in which the site was in use. The site was originally used for sand mining. Wastes that were disposed within the depression created by sand mining include solvents, sludge from boiler cleaning operations, grease trap wastes, Imhoff tank skimmings containing oil and grease, and animal carcasses. Currently, most of the site, which is overgrown with trees, is covered by approximately 2 feet of soil with some scattered surface debris.

2.1.4 Site 4 - Burning Pad Residue Landfill

Site 4 is a 6-acre landfill located adjacent to the explosives burning facility just south of West Road. This area was in use between 1940 and 1975 and received an estimated 595 tons of waste during the time in which the site was in use. Carbon-zinc batteries from underwater weapons, burning pad residues, tree stumps, fly ash from coal-fired burners, mine casings, electrical equipment, and transformers were reportedly buried at this site. A large battery disposal area was identified in the southeastern portion of the site. In addition, construction debris, pipes, glass, concrete, bottles, cans, and drums have been discovered in various locations within the 6-acre area. An ash pile was present

in the northeastern corner of the site. A removal action was conducted at Site 4 during the summer of 1994 and the area has been revegetated.

2.1.5 Site 5 - Surplus Transformer Storage Area

Site 5 is located near Barracks Road in the northeastern portion of the Station adjacent to the south end of Building 76. Site 5 is also referred to as OU I. The area is approximately 1,000 square feet in size and is fenced. Two concrete pads are located within the fenced area; the remainder of the area is covered with gravel. This site was used from 1940 to 1981 as a storage area for surplus polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-containing transformers which were stored on and around the two large concrete pads. After 1981, only non-leaking transformers were stored at this location. Currently, the stored transformers have been removed and the site is no longer used as a transformer storage area.

An estimated 300 pounds of PCB-containing fluids reportedly leaked from stored transformers. A cleanup effort, conducted in December 1982, included the removal of contaminated soil at Site 5. However, the success of this removal effort was not documented (i.e., no information on the amount of soil removed, verification samples, and type and source of backfill). The recently completed Round One RI investigation and a Risk Evaluation confirmed that the contaminated soil was successfully removed during this effort. Based on the results of the Risk Evaluation and limited confirmational sampling by USEPA Region III, a No Action ROD was finalized for Site 5 (OU I) on September 29, 1994.

2.1.6 Site 6 - Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Impoundment

Site 6 contains a 3-acre, unlined, surface impoundment located adjacent to wetlands along a small tributary to the main branch of Felgates Creek. This area was in use between 1942 and 1975 and received contaminated wastewater from the explosives reclamation facility at Building 109 and from weapons loading operations at Building 110 (AOC C and SWMU 179). The impoundment area was used as a settling basin for nitramine-contaminated washdown water. In 1974, a carbon adsorption tower was installed to treat the contaminated wastewater prior to discharge into the drainage way. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit was granted by USEPA Region III to allow this discharge. In 1986, the effluent from the tower was diverted to the sanitary sewer

and ultimately to the Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD). Currently, the impoundment collects only surface runoff from the area between Buildings 109 and 110 (Building 109, pipes and wires have been identified in the FFA for additional RI/FS activities). In addition, north of the impoundment and northwest of Building 1249, a previously excavated area has been identified via aerial photography. This area is currently wooded, but a concrete foundation and concrete rubble are evident.

2.1.7 Site 7 - Plant 3 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area

1.1

1 1

Site 7 is a 300-foot long (approximately) drainage area located adjacent to wetlands and along a small tributary to Felgates Creek, approximately one mile upstream from the confluence of Felgates Creek and the York River. This drainage area received nitramine-contaminated wastewater from Loading Plant 3 between the years 1945 and 1975. In 1974, a carbon adsorption tower was installed to treat the contaminated wastewater prior to discharge into the drainage way. An NPDES permit was granted by the USEPA Region III to allow this discharge. In 1986, the effluent from the tower was diverted to the sanitary sewer and ultimately to HRSD. Currently, the site has reverted to a natural drainage area and receives no discharge from the Plant 3 complex.

2.1.8 Site 8 - NEDED Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area

Site 8 is a 300-foot drainage way located along the eastern branch of Felgates Creek, approximately 1.5 miles from the confluence of the creek and the York River. This area received wastewater from the Naval Explosives Development Engineering Department (NEDED) complex (Building 456) from 1940 to 1975. The wastewater reportedly contained unspecified solvents, spent/neutralized acids, and nitramine compounds. In 1974, a carbon adsorption tower was installed to treat the contaminated wastewater prior to discharge into the drainage area. An NPDES permit was granted by USEPA Region III to allow this discharge. In 1986, the effluent from the tower was diverted to the sanitary sewer and ultimately to HRSD. Currently, the site has reverted to a natural drainage area.

2.1.9 Site 9 - Plant 1 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area

Site 9 is a 600-foot drainage ditch located just east of Lee Pond, which empties into the eastern branch of Felgates Creek and topographically downslope from Site 19 (Section 2.1.15). This area was reportedly in use from the late 1930s to 1975. Contaminants in the wastewater from Plant 1 (Building 10) included nitramine compounds as well as organic solvents. During the more than 40 years that the drainage area was used, an estimated 6,800 pounds of nitramine- and solvent-contaminated material may have been discharged to the area. A carbon adsorption tower was installed in 1974 to treat the contaminated wastewater prior to discharge into the drainage area. An NPDES permit was granted by USEPA Region III to allow this discharge. In 1986, the effluent from the tower was diverted to the sanitary sewer and ultimately to HRSD. Currently, the site has reverted to a natural drainage way for surface runoff from surrounding areas and receives no discharge from the Plant I complex. A limited removal action was conducted for hard waste present at Site 9 in the natural drainage way between Bollman Road and Lee Pond during the summer and early fall of 1994.

2.1.10 Site 11 - Abandoned Explosives Burning Pits

Site 11 is an area of approximately 0.5-acres located south of Dudley Road, east of Main Road, west of Site 1, and north of a drainage channel leading to Indian Field Creek. This area was used from 1930 to 1950 for burning ordnance and ordnance-contaminated waste. Ashes and residues from the open burning of nitramine-containing wastes and sludges are potentially present at the site. During the 20 years that the pits were used approximately 200 pounds of nitramine waste residues may have been deposited. Currently, the area is thickly vegetated.

2.1.11 Site 12 - Barracks Road Landfill

Site 12 is a 4-acre landfill located east of Barracks Road, north of the community of Lackey, and northwest of the Colonial National Historical Park along a drainage swale leading to Ballard Creek. This area was in operation from approximately 1925 to the mid-1960s. Wastes reported to have been disposed include refuse, scrap wood, and nitramine-contaminated packaging. Because this facility was the predecessor to the Dudley Road Landfill (Site 1), it is likely that wastes similar to those identified at Site 1 (Section 2.1.1), including solvents, also were disposed in this area. The

landfill received an estimated 1,400 tons of waste during the time the site was in use. Adjacent to the landfill are two incinerators (SWMU 142 and SWMU 143) formerly used to burn a variety of waste, both industrial and nonindustrial. Incineration ash from incineration activities was disposed on the hillside behind the incinerator buildings. Scrap metal, charred wood and cloth, and medicine bottles were observed in the ash. Located approximately 400 feet east of Site 12 is the Wood/Debris Disposal Area (formerly SWMU 164 and now considered a part of Site 12), which is approximately 4 acres in size. This area consists of a steep ravine in which wooden pallets and construction debris have been disposed. Each area is currently vegetated and drains toward Ballard Creek.

2.1.12 Site 16 - West Road Landfill

Site 16 is a 5-acre area located adjacent to West Road near Indian Field Road. This site was operated from the early 1950s to the early 1960s. Site 16/SSA 16 also is referred to as OU II. Wastes reported to have been disposed include dry carbon-zinc (Leclanche) batteries, banding materials, pressure transmitting fluid, unknown types of chemicals, and 55-gallon drums (contents unknown). An investigation at this site in 1992 (Baker/Weston, 1993a) confirmed the presence of drums, scrap metal, batteries, mine casings, and construction debris. Another waste area was also identified beneath one of the drum piles. This waste area consisted of glass containers, cans, and newspapers. Landfill boundaries are not evident from visual observation of the area. The site is wooded, except for the northern portion along West Road, which is covered with grasses. A removal action was conducted at Site 16 during the summer of 1994 to eliminate drums, scrap metal, batteries, and construction debris. Site 16 was evaluated in conjunction with SSA 16 because of its near proximity and geophysical data which indicate overlap between the two areas. Based on the results of the risk evaluation and limited confirmational sampling by USEPA Region III, a "No Further Remedial Action with Institutional Controls" ROD was finalized for Site 16/SSA 16 (OU II) on September 29, 1995.

2.1.13 Site 17 - Holm Road Landfill

Site 17 is a 2-acre landfill located south of Holm Road and east of Main Road. The site was operated for approximately 10 years, from the 1950s to the 1960s. Wastes reportedly disposed include acid batteries from underwater weapons, hydraulic fluids (Dolconik) from the demilling of torpedoes, other types of hydraulic fluids, drums from the Public Works Department and ordnance

production shops, and scrap metal. An estimated 60 tons of waste was deposited during the period the landfill was in use. Currently, the site is overgrown with mature trees and no evidence of surficial waste is apparent. In addition, results from the geophysical investigation of this site during the Round One RI did not indicate any evidence of buried material.

2.1.14 Site 18 - Building 476 Discharge Area

Site 18 is a one-quarter mile long, unlined drainage ditch located north of Building 476 in the southeastern area of the Station along a small tributary leading to Lee Pond. This area was in use for approximately 20 years from the 1940s to the 1960s. The discharge into the area reportedly contained battery acid waste, consisting of hydrochloric acid or calcium hydroxide and dissolved metals such as lead, cadmium, nickel, and antimony. An estimated 100 to 200 pounds of metal may have been discharged during the operational period. Battery acid waste is no longer discharged from Building 476 into this drainage way.

2.1.15 Site 19 - Conveyor Belt Soils at Building 10

Site 19 is a 500-foot long soil strip located beneath and around Building 10, approximately 300 feet from Site 9 and connected to Site 9 via a concrete drainage channel. Nitramine-contaminated soil was reported beneath the conveyor belt between Buildings 10 and 98. In 1973/1974, soil below the conveyor belt was removed; however, later tests indicated that contamination remained.

2.1.16 Site 21 - Battery and Drum Disposal Area

Site 21 covers approximately 1 acre and is located south of West Road adjacent to the ravine that separates Site 21 from Site 4. Historical information for this site is limited. Wastes identified in this area include various sized cans and drums, dry carbon-zinc batteries (Leclanche), empty solvent containers, and scrap metal. A removal action was conducted at Site 21 during the summer of 1994 to remove batteries, drums and debris. The site has been revegetated in those areas affected by the removal.

2.1.17 Site 22 - Burn Pad

Site 22 covers approximately 9 acres and is located in the central portion of the Station between Sites 4 and 21. A circular array of 11 steel burning pans were used for burning waste plastic explosives and spent solvents. The pans surround a 150-foot inch diameter circular area. Currently the burn pad is being used to conduct a pilot scale treatability study for explosives-contaminated soil. Soil samples were obtained from the "footprint" of the biocell prior to the placement of liners and footers for the rail system, upon which a gantry rests. Analytical data are not yet available for soil or other environmental media at Site 22.

2.1.18 Site 23 - Building 428 Teague Road Disposal Area

Site 23 (a portion of former SSA 1) is approximately 2.8 acres in size and is located northeast of Building 428, in the northeast portion of the Station along the Station boundary. The size of the site is comprised of 5 smaller areas of SSA 1 which are adjacent to the railroad tracks, the unnamed ditch and is within the western portion of the former SSA boundary. The York River is located to the north of Site 23 and Roosevelt Pond bounds the area to the west/northwest. The area is wooded and bisected by a railroad track that was constructed in 1919 and operated until 1989. Disposal activities reportedly began in 1940 and ceased in 1960. A pier fire occurred in the mid-1950s and debris from this fire may have been disposed in this area (1955 to 1957). Areal photography suggests that past waste storage practices occurred at Site 23 (primarily in 1945). From 1960 to the present there is no evidence of additional waste storage or release. However, a land survey, conducted in the fall of 1993 as part of a removal action, indicated discrete piles of debris that appear to have been dumped on top of native soil, while other areas of debris appear to be partially buried. The debris was identified as concrete rubble; scrap metal; wooden pilings and railroad ties; empty fuel cans; empty, open, and corroded drums; asbestos pipe insulation; and shingles. A removal action was conducted during the summer and early fall of 1994 to remove surface debris present at Site 23. Items removed included two 55-gallon drums of paint cans/spilled paint, 443 tons of wooden creosote timbers (remains of the burnt pier), 763 tons of ordinary non-hazardous debris, 1,119 tons of debris containing non-friable asbestos, 1,680 pounds of pipe wrapped with friable asbestos, 31 tons of recyclable metal, and two truck batteries. Approximately 5,800 tons of TNT and trinitrobenzene contaminated ash/soil also was removed from an area north of the railroad tracks at the northeast portion of the site. Contaminants of potential concern at Site 23 include polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) that may be associated with former disposal activities. Additional IRP activities will include investigation of subsurface contamination, impacts on shallow groundwater and an ecological evaluation/habitat evaluation of the unnamed ditch.

2.1.19 Site 24 - Aviation Field

Site 24 (a portion of former SSA 6) is an area (approximately 15 acres in size) located around the helicopter landing pad. It is bounded by Bellfield Road to the north, railroad tracks to the east, Main Road to the south, and storage areas to and west. The site is an open grassy area around the helicopter landing pad where mine components coated with PCB-1254 containing antifoulant were discovered in the subsurface soil. Historically, the area was used as an aviation field until 1927, after which it was used for storage of munitions in underground caches. Aerial photography indicates that peak storage activity on the ground surface occurred in 1968. No storage of liquid or hazardous waste was reported or observed. In addition, this area may also have been used briefly as an explosives burning area although available data do not indicate the presence of nitramines/nitroaromatics.

2.1.20 Site 25 - Building 373 Rocket Plant

Site 25 (a portion of former SSA 7), the Rocket Plant, is approximately 0.14 acres in size and is located immediately northwest of Building 373. Site 25 consists of a 500-gallon (approximately) precast concrete pipe, which was used as an underground storage tank (UST), and the associated cast iron piping. The concrete pipe was installed vertically into the ground with a bottom section cast in the concrete pipe.

Prior to the 1960s, wash/rinse water from the cleanup of formulation/pouring equipment drained into a settling basin within the building for removal of suspended solids. The solids were open burned at Site 4 (Burning Pad Residue Landfill). The wash/rinse water subsequently was discharged into Felgates Creek. The discharge line to the creek was plugged in the early 1960s and a 500-gallon UST was installed to contain the wash/rinse water. From the 1960s to 1980s, the UST received batch wastes from NEDED assembly operations of 2.75-inch rockets as well as the wash/rinse waters. Once the tank was filled, the water was filtered through a carbon unit and discharged to the sanitary sewer system. The UST was closed in the early 1980s when the current aboveground

storage tank (AST) was installed. Materials contained within the tanks consisted of binders, curatives, catalysts, stabilizers, and explosives.

In addition to the above areas, USEPA Region III personnel reportedly found "hard waste" (empty mine casings and other miscellaneous wastes) in the woods south/southeast of SSA 7. A removal action was conducted in June/July 1996 to remove the 500-gallon UST and associated piping. During the removal action, the bottom section, which had been cast to the concrete pipe, was heavily stained. The soil from beneath the UST was removed. There were no visible signs of staining along the sides of the UST or in the soil surrounding the sides of the UST. A strong solvent odor was prominent during the removal activities.

2.1.21 Site 26 - Building 1816 Mark 48 Waste Otto Fuel Tank

I = I

Site 26 (formerly SSA 18) is approximately 6.7 acres in size and is located in the central portion of the Station at Building 1816 north of Sharpe Road and west of the intersection of Sharpe Road and Lee Road. A 2,500-gallon concrete UST and network of ancillary drain pipes that was used formerly to store waste Otto fuel was located within this area. This fuel consists of a mixture of Otto fuel and water, which may have also contained oil, denatured ethyl alcohol, detergent, and trace amounts of cyanide, halogenated hydrocarbons, and heavy metals. In late 1987, waste Otto fuel was discovered leaking from the tank. The fuel was removed, the tank was cleaned, and a RCRA closure permit was filed. In March 1995, the 2,500-gallon waste Otto fuel UST was removed along with an 8,000-gallon UST located in the vicinity. Site 26 has been retained as an IRP site because of chlorinated volatiles detected in shallow groundwater. The extent of this contamination has not yet been adequately defined.

2.2 <u>Site Screening Area Descriptions</u>

This section describes the history of past disposal practices at each of the SSAs currently included in the FFA and the four SSAs which have been added for investigation and evaluation which were not included in the FFA. As these are primarily newly identified areas, there is limited information available. The information contained in the following sections has been adapted from USEPA Region III's "RCRA Solid Waste Management Unit Investigation," (December 1992) and "Study

Area Analysis, Yorktown Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia," Volume 1 (November 1992).

2.2.1 Site Screening Area 2 - Former EOD Burning/Disposal Area

SSA 2 is an irregular, U-shaped area located at the north end of the existing Explosives Ordnance Disposal (EOD) range and occupies an area of approximately 400 feet by 450 feet. The area was wooded and strewn with non-explosive arming devices, MK 46 shipping containers, various types of scrap metal, and debris. Numerous earthen berms and depressions indicate the historical use of bulldozers and other earth-moving equipment throughout the SSA. Demolition records indicate that the area was the original site of the EOD range for WPNSTA Yorktown and was actively used throughout the 1950s and 1960s for routine destruction of ordnance material. The area was closed in 1970 and operations were moved south to the present EOD range location. Anecdotal information indicates that the move was prompted by growing concerns that range operations might cause forest fires in the wooded areas bordering the SSA. A removal action was conducted at SSA 2 during the summer and early fall of 1994 to remove three dump truck loads of scrap metal, 14 containers of lead, and 11 live ordnance pieces. The scrap metal included torpedo casings, bomb casings, powder cans, used detonation devices, tractor parts, marsh matting and other miscellaneous debris. Based on the results of the SSP, no further RI/FS activities will be conducted at SSA 2; however, long-term monitoring of groundwater will be conducted as part of the Part B RCRA permit. Specifications of the long-term monitoring will be presented as part of the final permit.

2.2.2 Site Screening Area 3 - Fire Training Pits and Vicinity

SSA 3 occupies an area of approximately 2.7 acres and is located just north of Main Road and Site 16, the West Road Landfill, in the north central portion of the Station. The area consists of three concrete oil pits; one is T-shaped and the other two are rectangular. One rectangular pit is located at the eastern end of the field, the second rectangular pit is located in the western end of the field, and the T-shaped pit is located in the central section of the field, where a patch of stressed vegetation is evident. Berms were built around each of the pit areas in 1986 and a roof was added to each area in 1991. Debris was reportedly placed in each of the pits, doused with jet fuel and set on fire. In addition, in the vicinity of the pits, there appeared to be portions of a tanker trailer that was formerly used for confined space entry training. The trailer is open on the bottom and placed directly on the

soil. The inside of the trailer is blackened and burned. A removal action was conducted during the late spring/early summer of 1996 to remove the fire training pits. Confirmational soil analytical data are not yet available for SSA 3.

2.2.3 Site Screening Area 4 - Weapons Casing/Drum Disposal Area

SSA 4 occupies approximately one-half acre between Main Road and Bypass Road at the headwaters of one of the tributaries leading to Roosevelt Pond. The area consists of a ravine in which debris, including weapons casings and drums, were deposited. There is a flat, grassy area just along the roadway, indicating that this area may have been an old landfill. Some of the material in the ravine may have been present as a result of landfilling activities. A removal action was conducted at SSA 4 during the summer and early fall of 1994 to remove surface debris in the ravine.

2.2.4 Site Screening Area 5 - Bypass Road Landfill

SSA 5 is located just north of Bypass Road and covers approximately 0.9 acres. This area consists of a ravine in which debris is evident. A small stream passes through the site and exits from a culvert that begins south of Bypass Road. The small stream is the second tributary which flows into Roosevelt Pond. Both Bypass Road and the railroad system were constructed in 1919 and are still in use.

Metal debris, with lesser amounts of concrete and miscellaneous materials, were present at SSA 5. Two empty drums were present. No wood materials were identified among the surface debris piles. A removal action was conducted at SSA 5 during the summer of 1994 to remove the small amount of ordinary debris including empty drums, pipes, scrap metal, and rubble.

2.2.5 Site Screening Area 8 - Building 350 Rail Roundhouse Maintenance Area Trench Outfall

SSA 8 occupies an area of approximately 0.4 acres, and is located outside Building 350, on the western side of the railroad tracks, in the southeastern corner of the Station. Within Building 350 there is one concrete trench, which was (and is presently) used to access train engines from below. The trench is used for train maintenance and there are no records of any releases from the trench.

Some dripping from the maintenance activities may have fallen into the trench, but these were covered with absorbent material and put into drums for disposal. The floor of the trench appears heavily stained; however, the trench drain has been plugged. The drain pipe from the trench leads to a catch basin approximately 100 yards south of the locomotive repair building. The outfall associated with the catch basin extends under the railroad tracks toward Bollman Road. Natural surface drainage (overland flow) extends under Bollman Road toward the wooded area east of Site 18.

1 1

2.2.6 Site Screening Area 9 - Building 1751 Chemistry Laboratory Neutralization Unit and Drainage Area

SSA 9 occupies an area of approximately 1.9 acres, and is located adjacent to Building 1751 in the north central portion of the Station (near Site 8, the NEDED Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area). This SSA consists of a below-grade cylindrical unit into which acids from the Chemistry Lab are discharged for neutralization. The integrity of the unit is unknown, it is below ground. In addition, there are four underground septic tanks in the area. Historical records indicate that industrial waste may have been stored in these tanks.

2.2.7 Site Screening Area 10 - Building 28 X-Ray Facility Tank Drain Field

SSA 10 is located at Building 28 in the south central portion of the Station and occupies an area of approximately 5.8 acres. The area consists of a septic tank drain field that receives sanitary wastewater from the X-Ray Facility at Building 28. Before silver recovery units were installed, the tanks may have stored hazardous wastes. Stressed vegetation is apparent in this area.

2.2.8 Site Screening Area 11 - Building 3 Neutralization Unit

SSA 11 is located at the southeast corner of Building 3 in the eastern section of the Station (southwest of Site 12 near SSAs 12 and 13) and occupies an area of approximately 0.2 acres. SSA 11 consists of an open, metal tank (approximately 3 feet by 5 feet by 3 feet deep) and associated trench and sump. This tank was apparently used for neutralization of wastes from an unknown process, but has been inactive for at least 15 years. Chipping and pitting are evident in the

trench and sump. The trench drains to the storm sewer system. The outfall from the SSA 11 storm sewer system is located in the vicinity of the headwaters of Ballard Creek.

2.2.9 Site Screening Area 12 - Public Works Storage Yard/Building 683 Vicinity

SSA 12 is approximately 1.5 acres in size and is located in the Public Works (PW) storage yard and the surrounding area in the eastern portion of the Station near Site 12 and SSAs 11 and 13. Surface water bodies are not located in near proximity of this SSA. One area consists of a field, approximately 150 feet by 300 feet, in which waste generated by the Public Works Department is stored. Drums of used motor oil and used batteries were observed on pallets and directly on the ground (Kearney, 1992). Historically, the area was used to store old tires. Another area, controlled by Building 645, consists of a fenced in yard used to store new electrical transformers and other electrical equipment. Used or damaged transformers were not stored at SSA 12. The new transformers were staged on pallets before installation. Historical records indicated that wastes may have been stored in this area in the past. In addition, there is a formerly wooded area where demolition debris were reportedly deposited. Concrete debris are visible at the edge of the area. Currently, approximately one-half of the area is used for vehicle storage.

In September 1994, a soil investigation was conducted by Baker at SSA 12 related to the proposed location of a new building (P-518). This investigation involved the sampling of surface and subsurface soil to determine if site soil was contaminated, and thus, affecting the construction of the new building (Baker, 1995).

In February 1996, the potential presence of an UST was discovered during site reconnaissance. It is reported that the UST is a gasoline UST and as such will be addressed under the Department of Defense (DoD) UST Program.

2.2.10 Site Screening Area 13 - Building 529 Battery Drainage Area

SSA 13 occupies an area of approximately one-half of an acre and is located outside of Building 529 in the eastern portion of the Station near Site 12 and SSAs 11 and 12. The area consists of pavement where neutralized battery washwater, created from washing the external portion of the batteries and neutralizing the washwater with baking soda, was released and migrated to a storm drain

approximately 100 feet away. The storm drain is located below the southeastern corner of the concrete platform of Building 529. The pavement on the western side of Ballard Road and the eastern side of Building 529 is sloping on all sides toward the storm drain. The surface water is channeled to the storm sewer system and eventually to the Ballard Creek headwaters. The entire area is asphalt covered. The pavement is currently worn, but intact, with some vegetation apparent.

2.2.11 Site Screening Area 14 - Building 537 Discharge to Felgates Creek

I/J

SSA 14 occupies an area of approximately 0.4 acres and is located outside of Building 537 between Site 8 (NEDED Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area) and SSA 9 (Building 1751 Chemistry Laboratory Neutralization Unit and Drainage Area), in the north central portion of the Station. This SSA consists of a pipe leading from the building, through which nitramine-contaminated wastewater was reportedly discharged to Felgates Creek. Some rubble and rusted piping were found where this pipe was reportedly located.

2.2.12 Site Screening Area 15 - Sewage Treatment Plant #1/Sludge Drying Beds and Discharge Area

SSA 15 is comprised of the sewage treatment plant (STP) #1/Sludge Drying Beds and Discharge Area and represents AOCs 5, 6, and 7, which are also former sewage treatment plants. SSA 15 is located in the southeastern corner of the Station, east of Buildings 3 and 4 and south of Site 12 (Barracks Road Landfill). This site covers approximately 0.3 acres and consists of an Imhoff tank, a trickling filter, a sludge drying bed, and a chlorination unit. Wastewater reportedly entered the Imhoff tank, which operated as a primary settling basin for the waste. The water then was passed through the trickling filter for biological treatment and pumped back to the Imhoff tank for secondary settling. The water was chlorinated in the chlorination unit and discharged to a tributary of Ballard Creek. Sludge from the Imhoff tank periodically was removed and placed in the sludge drying bed. STP #1 received and managed only sanitary waste from physical plants and the Officer's Club located nearby, but may have treated nitramine-containing and other industrial wastewater. WPNSTA Yorktown personnel have reported, during the operation of STP #1, a mercury-containing bearing on the trickling filter cracked, allowing mercury to be released. Also, WPNSTA Yorktown personnel indicated that sludges from SSA 15 were transported to SSA 6 and landfarmed. Currently, substantial vegetation is present in the sludge drying bed. Based on the results of the SSP, no further

RI/FS activities will be conducted however, because of its proximity to Site 12 and the Industrial Area, final action at SSA 15 will be addressed in the Site 12 ROD. No further RI efforts are recommended for AOCs 5, 6, and 7.

2.2.13 Site Screening Area 16 - Building 402 Metal Disposal Area and Environs

SSA 16 is located between West Road and a set of railroad tracks, just west of Building 402 and encompasses the northern area of Site 16. The area is a large dirt field, approximately 0.4 acres in size, where scrap metal was stored. Site 16/SSA 16 also is referred to as OU II. Dumpsters containing scrap metal are located on the lower southwest side of the yard; scrap metal and empty drums also are scattered over the ground surface near these dumpsters. This area was reportedly used for scrap metal storage prior to the construction of the Hazardous Waste Storage Facility.

SSA 16 was evaluated in conjunction with Site 16 because of its near proximity and geophysical data which indicate overlap between the two areas. Based on the results of the risk evaluation and limited confirmational sampling by USEPA Region III, a "No Further Remedial Action with Institutional Controls" ROD was finalized for Site 16/SSA 16 (OU II) on September 29, 1995.

2.2.14 Site Screening Area 17 - Building 1456 Mark 46 Waste Otto Fuel Tank

SSA 17, which occupies an area of approximately 330 feet by 310 feet, is located northwest of SSA 18 in the central portion of the Station. This SSA is located approximately 400 feet north of Sharpe Road and approximately 2,000 feet northwest of the intersection of Sharpe and Lee Roads. This area previously consisted of an inactive, 5,000-gallon, underground steel tank and a network of ancillary drain pipes; the tank was located under the parking apron. This tank was used to store waste Otto fuel generated during cleaning procedures associated with MK 46 torpedo activities. Waste Otto fuel is a mixture of Otto fuel and water which potentially contained oil, denatured ethyl alcohol, detergent, and trace amounts of cyanide. In June 1988, a tank integrity test was performed on the waste Otto fuel tank. The tank system failed the hydrostatic integrity test and was subsequently taken out of service, the floor drains leading to the tank were sealed, and a RCRA closure and post-closure plan was submitted to VDEQ in November 1988. The 5,000-gallon waste Otto fuel UST system was removed in March 1995. The MK 46 torpedo shop subsequently accumulated waste Otto fuel in compatible, 55-gallon drums, which were stored for less than

90 days prior to transport off site for disposal. Waste Otto fuel is not currently generated or stored at SSA 17. Based on the results of the SSP, no further RI/FS activities will be conducted at SSA 17.

2.2.15 Site Screening Area 19 - Beaver Road/Ponds 11 and 12 Drainage Area and Environs

SSA 19, which occupies an area of approximately 164 acres (3,000 feet by 3,500 feet), is located in the northwestern section of the Station and encompasses the area surrounding the EOD range, including drainage into Ponds 11 and 12. A smaller pond, Pond 11A, is situated along the northwest perimeter of the SSA. SSA 19 is circumjacent to SSA 2. The area is used for explosive waste destruction. The EOD range began operations in 1970 when the former disposal range (SSA 2) was taken out of service. Soil is stacked approximately 40 feet above ground surface, holes are dug about 12 to 20 feet into the mound of soil, the holes are filled with explosive ordnance and backfilled. The explosives are detonated; the same soil is used repeatedly. During the winter, this area is covered and grass is grown to prevent erosion. Unlined settling ponds collect runoff, through pipes, from this area. Effluent from these ponds may discharge to nearby Ponds 11 and 12 and ultimately to King Creek and the York River. In addition, nine metal containers of varying sizes are used for burning explosive waste when hotter burning is required. This type of burning is performed one to two times per year, primarily in the summer. Based on the results of the SSP, no further RI/FS activities will be conducted at SSA 19.

2.2.16 Site Screening Area 20 - Lee Pond

Lee Pond is an approximately 4.1 acre pond located in the east central portion of the Station. The pond receives drainage from Building 10 at Site 9 located due east of the pond. The drainage area is approximately 500 to 600 feet in length and was subjected to a limited removal action in 1994. Lee Pond also receives stormwater runoff from the industrial area and sites therein such as Sites 18 and 19 and SSAs 8 and 22.

Lee Pond empties into a channel which in turn flows around the Site 16/SSA 16 study area into Felgates Creek. The pond has been subjected to limited investigations by the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1994 and a Focused Biological Sampling and Preliminary Risk Evaluation (Baker, 1993b). Water levels in Lee Pond are raised and lowered during summer and winter respectively for support of the local ecology.

2.2.17 Site Screening Area 21 - Roosevelt Pond

Roosevelt Pond is an approximately 22.2 acre pond located in the eastern portion of the Station. The pond receives stormwater from the industrial area and sites therein such as SSAs 4 and 5.

Roosevelt Pond empties into the York River. The pond has been subjected to limited investigations by the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1994 and a Focused Biological Sampling and Preliminary Risk Evaluation (Baker, 1993b).

2.2.18 Site Screening Area 22 - Sand Blasting Grit Pile

Site Screening Area 22 (formerly AOC 4) is an area which consists of approximately 0.5 acres in the eastern portion of WPNSTA Yorktown adjacent to Building 530. Building 530 was built and put into operation in 1945 and operated until the early to mid 1980s. Bomb fins and wings, inert bomb casings, and various other inert ordnance items were grit blasted inside Building 530 in a blasting booth and outside at the northern end of the building near a personnel door. Blasting material may have been composed of coal slag or steel grit. The blasting booth within the building utilized a dust collector. The dust which was accumulated in the dust collector may have been deposited in the vicinity of the northern side of Building 530. AOCs were investigated in 1995 by Baker Environmental, Inc. (Baker). Elevated concentrations of cadmium were detected in SSA 22 soil samples which warranted its retention for further investigation under the SSP.

2.2.19 Site Screening Area 23 - Coal Storage Area

The Coal Storage Area (formerly AOC 21) is an area of approximately 1 acre adjacent to Building 708. Coal was stored in this area from 1953 to the late 1970s. The coal pile was surrounded by a 9-inch thick reinforced concrete wall. The walled in storage area is referred to as Building 1827. Every 20 feet a hole 2 by 6 inches was located at the ground surface of Building 1827 on the north side of the walled area. These holes were to release water from the coal storage area. Currently, only residual coal remains within the coal storage area. As with other AOCs, SSA 23 was investigated in 1995 and elevated concentrations of inorganics including arsenic and vanadium were detected in surface soil samples. Some samples were collected near the drainage holes in the wall surrounding the coal pile. Additional investigation under the SSP is therefore necessary to determine potential human health risks and ecological concerns associated with this SSA.

2.2.20 Site Screening Area 24 - Bracken Road Incinerator and Environs

The Bracken Road incinerator (formerly AOC 22) is in an area approximately 0.1 acres located north of Site 5 (Surplus Transformer Storage Area), northeast of a cooling pond (76A), and south of railroad tracks. The USEPA conducted sampling activities and detected metals and nitramine compounds exceeding regulatory screening levels. Additional investigation under the SSP is therefore necessary to determine potential human health risks and ecological concerns associated with this SSA.

SECTION 2.0 TABLES

TABLE 2-1


SITES AND SITE SCREENING AREAS NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

[<u> </u>	
Site No.	Site Name	SSA No.	SSA Name
i	Dudley Road Landfill	2	Former Explosives Ordnance Disposal Burning/Disposal Area
2	Turkey Road Landfill	3	Fire Training Pits and Vicinity
3	Group 16 Magazine Landfill	4	Weapons Casing/Drum Disposal Area
4	Burning Pad Residue Landfill	5	Bypass Road Landfill
5	Surplus Transformer Storago Area	8	Building 350 Rail Roundhouse Maintenance Area Trench Outfall
6	Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Impoundment	9	Building 1751 Chemistry Laboratory Neutralization Unit and Drainage Area
7	Plant 3 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area	10	Building 28 X-Ray Facility Drain Field
8	Naval Explosives Development Engineering Department (NEDED) Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area	11	Building 3 Neutralization Unit
9	Plant 1 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area	12	Public Works Storage Yard/ Building 683 Vicinity
11	Abandoned Explosives Burning Pits	13	Building 529 Battery Drainage Area
12	Barracks Road Landfill	14	Building 537 Discharge to Felgates Creek
16	West Road Landfill	15	Sewage Treatment Plant #1 Sludge Drying Beds and Discharge Area
17	Holm Road Landfill	16	Building 402 Metal Disposal Area and Environs
18	Building 476 Discharge Area	17	Building 1456 Mark 46 Waste Offe Tank
19	Conveyor Belt Soils at Building 10	19	Beaver Road/Pands 11 and 12 Dramage Area and Environs
21	Battery and Drum Disposal Area	20	Lee Pond
22	Burn Pad	21	Roosevelt Pond
23	Building 428 Teague Road Disposal Area	22	Sand Blasting Grit Pile (AOC 4)
24	Aviation Field	23	Coal Storage Area (AOC 21)
25	Building 373 Rocket Plant	24	Bracken Road Incinerator and Environs (AOC 22)
26	Building 1816 Mark 48 Waste Otto Tank		

Note:

Shading indicates field investigations and report writing activities have been completed.

SECTION 2.0 FIGURES



3.0 CERCLA PROCESS ACTIVITIES

J J

The investigation and remediation activities to be completed at identified sites at WPNSTA Yorktown will follow the guidelines established by the USEPA as part of the CERCLA process. Once an SSA has been identified as potentially containing contaminated media (soil, sediment, groundwater, etc.) and the site screening investigation and risk screening process (both limited in scope) have determined that a potential risk to human health and/or the environment exists, the SSA will be subjected to full RI/FS process. However, a removal action and/or an interim remedial action also may be appropriate. The decision to implement one or a combination of these actions at either already established RI/FS sites or SSAs is dependent upon the nature and extent of contamination at the site, how well it is characterized, the degree of associated human health and/or environmental risks, and the complexity of the potential remedial actions (i.e., how apparent the optimal remedy is). CERCLA processes are described below.

3.1 RI/FS Process

The RI/FS process is generally the longest step in investigating and remediating CERCLA sites. Figure 3-1 outlines the steps to remedial action under the RI/FS process. For the RI/FS, a full RI, Baseline Risk Assessment, and FS are completed, along with a Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) prior to the formal public comment period. After the public comments have been addressed as part of the Responsiveness Summary in the ROD, the ROD is placed in the Administrative Record. Subsequent to completion of the ROD, remedial design (RD) activities are initiated, followed by the implementation of the remedial action (RA).

Presumptive remedies also are part of the RI/FS process. Presumptive remedies apply to certain types of sites such as landfills which received a variety of waste types and where containment of these wastes is the preferred remedial alternative. Candidate sites for presumptive remedies should be identified early in the investigative process. Once identified, presumptive remedy sites follow the same general process as presented in Figure 3-1, but have streamlined RIs and FSs. Streamlined RI/FS documents evaluate the sites and site dynamics, evaluate risks and bypasses the initial screening and identification of remedial alternatives other than containment.

The FFA for WPNSTA Yorktown mandates the integration of the CERCLA Program with Station RCRA issues. The SSP was developed jointly by USEPA Region III, Commonwealth of Virginia and the Navy to address RCRA SWMUs and AOCs in a manner consistent with the CERCLA process. RCRA SWMUs and AOCs have been designated as SSAs and are evaluated to determine whether significant contamination exists to warrant further investigative or remedial activities (Figure 3-2). If unacceptable human health risks or ecological risks do not exist, SSAs are recommended for no further action. If risks do exist, removal actions, interim actions, or additional RI/FS activities are proposed and the SSA becomes an IRP site.

3.2 Removal Actions

Removal actions are those actions taken to clean up or remove released hazardous substances from the environment. In addition, a removal action also may be implemented to mitigate, minimize, or prevent damage to human health and the environment from a release or threat of a release by limiting exposure to the hazardous substances (i.e., security fencing or access limitation). Removal actions are classified as either time-critical or non-time-critical. Time-critical removal actions are conducted when there is an imminent threat to human health and the environment, such as corroded drums of wastes that are leaking into groundwater. Non-time-critical removal actions are defined as actions that, based on the degree of potential risk to human health and/or the environment, may be delayed for six months or more before on-site cleanup is initiated.

All removal actions which occurred at WPNSTA Yorktown were classified as non-time-critical removal actions. A removal action may be completed any time during the RI/FS process; however, it will often begin prior to the completion of the RI/FS to mitigate the spread of contamination. There are no removal actions currently planned at WPNSTA Yorktown.

Figure 3-3 shows the general process for non-time-critical removal actions. Rather than preparing an FS, an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) is completed which focuses only on the substances to be removed and not on all potentially contaminated media (other contaminated media will be addressed as part of the RI/FS process). Because the scope of a removal action is typically smaller than a final, full-scale remedial action, the time frames for completion of the EE/CA, related design efforts, and implementation of the removal action are much shorter than for a full scale FS.

The opportunity for public involvement is similar to the FS, with a public comment period and a Removal Action Memorandum completed to document the evaluation and choice of removal action procedures. It should be noted that a removal action may become the final remedial action if the risk screening/assessment results indicate that further remediation is not required for protection of human health and the environment. Where no further action is required at a site that has undergone a removal action, a no action ROD will be signed between the concerned parties in order to remove the site from the program.

3.3 Interim (Early) Remedial Actions

Early remedial actions are those activities which are designed to provide temporary mitigation of potential risks posed by a site until a final remedial action is selected. As with removal actions, early remedial actions usually take place prior to initiation of a full-scale FS because of the risks posed by the contamination in the area. For example, installation of a groundwater pump and treat system to control plume migration would be considered an early remedial action. Initiation of an early remedial action early in the CERCLA process might reduce costs in the long term by limiting the extent of contaminant migration.

The early remedial action process is shown in Figure 3-4. Rather than preparing an FS, a Focused FS is completed, as is an early action ROD to document the activities to be performed. Design and implementation activities follow. It should be noted that an early remedial action may become the final remedial action if the risk screening/assessment results indicate that further remediation is not required for protection of human health and the environment.

3.4 Presumptive Remedies

Presumptive remedies help to streamline the site cleanup process by eliminating the need for initial identification and screening of alternatives during the FS. Presumptive remedies are preferred technologies for common categories of sites based on historical patterns of remedy selection at similar types of sites. The selection of a presumptive remedy must be considered at the beginning of the RI/FS process so that particular attention can be paid to the risk evaluation, areas of potential contaminant migration, and identification of hot spots.

3.5 Treatability Studies

Treatability studies will be conducted prior to finalization of FS reports to better evaluate a particular technology's performance. Treatability studies are conducted to:


- Provide sufficient data to allow treatment alternatives to be fully developed and evaluated
- Support the remedial design of a selected alternative
- Reduce cost and performance uncertainties for treatment alternatives to acceptable levels to aid in remedy selection.

Treatability studies for explosives-contaminated soil are currently being conducted in FY 1996 and 1997 concurrent with ongoing IRP activities. These studies should provide data for FSs involving explosives-contaminated sites.

SECTION 3.0 FIGURES

FIGURE 3-1

RI/FS PROCESS




RI = Remedial Investigation
BRA = Baseline Risk Assessment

FS = Feasibility Study

ROD = Record of Decision (including Responsiveness Summary)

⁽¹⁾ Includes summary of any Interim Remedial Actions or Removal Actions for the Operable Unit


FIGURE 3-2
KEY DECISION POINTS DURING THE SITE SCREENING PROCESS



Note:

⁽¹⁾ Steps taken following the Removal Action will depend on the point at which the action is taken during the site screening and RI/FS processes.


FIGURE 3-3
NON-TIME CRITICAL REMOVAL ACTION PROCESS



EE/CA = Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis

(1) Includes Responsiveness Summary to Public Comment

FIGURE 3-4
INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTION PROCESS



FS = Feasibility Study
ROD = Record of Decision

4.0 RELATIVE RISK SITE EVALUATION

A quantitative and qualitative ranking system was devised by LANTDIV, USEPA Region III and the Commonwealth of Virginia to prioritize the investigation and remediation (if necessary) of IRP sites and SSAs, respectively, at WPNSTA Yorktown. The quantitative ranking evaluated potential human health and ecological risks posed by sites through a comparison to USEPA Region IX Preliminary Remediation Goal (PRG) values (USEPA, 1994a) and ecological criteria such as Federal Ambient Water Quality Criteria (AWQC). SSAs were evaluated through a review of area or process history and their proximity to the WPNSTA fence line. Appendix A-1 presents the former site ranking approach used at WPNSTA Yorktown.

The DoD formalized the site ranking process in 1994 by adopting the Relative Risk Ranking (RRR) approach (DoD, 1994; U.S. Navy, 1995). RRR is currently being used at all DoD sites to sequence investigative efforts at all SSAs and IRP sites. This section will present an overview of RRR and its use at the Station.

4.1 Relative Risk Ranking

RRR was developed by an interservice working group within DoD comprised of representatives from the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense Logistics Agency. The RRR framework has been presented to members of the Federal Facility Dialogue Committee, congressional staff, Federal and State regulators, and environmental interest groups. The function of the RRR framework is to catagorize sites into *High, Medium* and *Low* categories such that sites posing the greatest potential risk to human health and the environment are investigated first.

The RRR framework is based on information basic to risk assessment: potential sources, pathways, and receptors and is similar to the approach used previously at WPNSTA Yorktown. Media evaluated as part of the RRR framework include: groundwater, surface water, sediment, and soil (samples obtained from no deeper than 24"). Each medium is evaluated using three factors. These factors include the Contaminant Hazard Factor (CHF), the Migration Pathway Factor (MPF) and the Receptor Factor (RF). These factors will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

Revised: September 12, 1996

4.1.1 Contaminant Hazard Factor

The CHF is determined by calculating the ratio of the maximum detected concentration of a contaminant in a medium to a risk-based concentration value for the contaminant. USEPA Region IX PRGs are used to determine a CHF for human health. Region IX PRGs for potential carcinogens are multiplied by 100 to coincide with a 10⁻⁴ cancer risk. Region IX PRGs for noncarcinogens are not modified and correspond to Hazard Quotients of 1.0.

Ratios are derived for potential ecological risks using AWQC values or Lowest Observed Effects Levels (LOELs) and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) sediment values. For media containing more than one contaminant ratio from individual contaminants are summed. If the sum of the ratios are greater than 100, the CHF is considered to be significant. A sum of 2 to 100 is considered to be moderate CHF, and a ratio of less than 2 is considered to be a minimal CHF.

4.1.2 Migration Pathway Factor

Information about migration pathways of contamination for a site is summarized as the MPF. Ratings of *Evident, Potential*, and *Confined* are determined by an evaluation of the type of contaminant, professional judgement, and site-specific information. These ratings are defined below.

Evident - Analytical data or observable evidence that contamination is present at, is moving toward, or has moved to a point of potential exposure.

Potential - Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of evident or confined.

Confined - Low possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate to a point of potential exposure.

Revised: September 12, 1996

4.1.3 Receptor Factor

Information concerning the present or future likelihood of receptors for each site is summarized as the RF. Ratings as *Identified*, *Potential*, or *Limited* are determined by matching available site information with the following definitions.

Identified - Receptors identified that have access to contaminated media.

Potential - Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated media.

Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to contaminated media.

Potential human and ecological receptors, by medium, are as follows:

- Groundwater Potential human receptors include potential users of downgradient water supplies for consumption or in food production. Potential ecological receptors are not evaluated.
- Surface Water/Sediment Potential human receptors include downgradient water supply and potential recreational users. Potential ecological receptors include critical habitats, estuaries, National Parks, wilderness areas and preserves, and marine sanctuaries and habitats known to be used by proposed or designated endangered or threatened species.
- Surface Soil Potential human receptors include potential future residents (child and adult) and workers. Potential ecological receptors are not evaluated.

4.2 Relative Risk Ranking Results

Results of RRR are presented in Tables 4-1 and 4-2. Inputs for CHFs, MPFs and RFs are presented with corresponding output from RRR in Appendix A-2.

4.3 Site and SSA Prioritization

If the FY 1997 spending plan is approved, all IRP sites, and SSAs will be funded for investigation. The priority of the FY 1997 IRP work is as follows:

- Sites 23, 24, 25, and 26 Work Plan/Additional Field Investigation, RI/FS/PRAP/ROD
- SSAs 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 Work Plan/SSP Investigation/SSP Report(s)

Of the 10 remaining SSAs, those retained for further investigation as IRP sites will undergo an additional round of prioritization unless a remedial response and a final remedy can be developed subsequent to the Final SSP Report.

SECTION 4.0 TABLES

TABLE 4-1

SITES AND CORRESPONDING RANK DERIVED USING RELATIVE RISK RANKING NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

	Rank						
			Surface	Surface Water			
Site Number	Soil	Groundwater	Human	Marine	Sediment	Overall	Status
1	Low	High	Medium	NA	High	High	(2)
2	NA	Medium	Medium	NA	High	High	(1)
3	Low	High	NA	NA	NA	High	(2)
4	Medium	High	Medium	NA	High	High	(1)
6	Low	High	Medium	NA	High	High	(2)
7	Low	High	Medium	NA	Medium	High	(2)
8	Low	High	Medium	NA	Medium	High	(1)
9	Medium	High	Medium	High	High	High	(2)
11	High	Medium	NA	High	NA	High	(1)
12	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium	High	(2)
17	Low	High	NA	NA	NA	High	(1)
18	NA	High	Low	High	Medium	High	(1)
19	High	Low	NA	NA	Medium	High	(2)
21	High	Medium	NA	NA	NA	High	(1)
22	NA	NA	Low	High	NA	High	(1)
23	High	High	High	High	Medium	High	(3)
24	High	High	NA	NA	NA	High	(3)
25	High	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	(3)
26	Medium	Medium	NA	NA	NA	Medium	(3)

Status:

- (1) Work Plan/Field Investigation Initiated
- (2) Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Report Writing Initiated
- (3) IR Program Work to be funded FY97/98
- NA Not analyzed

TABLE 4-2

SSAs AND CORRESPONDING RANK DERIVED USING RELATIVE RISK RANKING NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

	Rank							
			Surface	Surface Water				
SSA Number	Soil	Groundwater	Human	Marine	Sediment	Overall	Groundwater	
3	NA	High	NA	NA	NA	High	(3)	
4	Medium	NA	NA	NA	NA	Medium	(3)	
5	Low	Low	NA	NA	NA	Low	(3)	
8	Low	NA	NA	NA	NA	Low	(2)	
9	Medium	Medium	NA	NA	NA	Medium	(3)	
10	NA	Medium	NA	NA	NA	Medium	(3)	
11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	(2)	
12	High	NA	NA	NA	NA	High	(2)	
13	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	(2)	
14	High	NA	Medium	NA	Medium	High	(1)	
20	NA	NA	NA	High	NA	High	(3)	
21	NA	NA	NA	High	High	High	(3)	
22	High	NA	NA	NA	NA	High	(3)	
23	High	NA	NA	NA	NA	High	(3)	
24	Medium	NA	NA	NA	High	High	(3)	

Status:

- (1) SSP Work Plan/Field Investigation Initiated
- (2) SSP Investigation/SSP Report Writing Initiated
- (3) IR Program Work to be funded FY97/98
- NA Not analyzed

5.0 SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN SCHEDULES

 $\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{J}$

This section presents the project schedules for the sites and SSAs identified in Section 2.0 and prioritized in Section 4.0. Schedules depicting the major project activities for each site and SSA are provided. These schedules are tentative based on funding allocation, completion of removal actions, and Government comments received for the reports. In addition, specific submittal deadlines planned for fiscal years 1997 and 1998 have been developed. Appendix B presents actions (removal actions and finalized reports) which have been completed. Appendix C presents sites and SSAs that will undergo removal actions. Appendix D presents detailed schedules for those activities funded during FY 1995. Detailed master schedules for sites potentially undergoing RI, Baseline Risk Assessment, FS or Remedial Design activities in FY 1996 are included in Appendix E, activities in FY 1997 are included in Appendix F, and activities in FY 1998 are included in Appendix G.

5.1 Scheduling Assumptions

Assumptions regarding document review periods and deviations from the FFA are discussed in the following sections.

5.1.1 Federal Facility Agreement Assumptions

RI/FS and RD/RA deliverables are classified as "primary" or "secondary" documents in the FFA, as shown in Table 5-1. A primary document is typically a major, discrete portion of an RI/FS or RD/RA activity, whereas a secondary document may be a discrete portion of a primary document or may serve as a feeder document to a primary document. The project schedules have been developed using the primary and secondary document review and comment process specified in the FFA. This process is summarized in Table 5-2.

The time required for review will vary according to the length and complexity of the document. In an effort to expedite document finalization, the draft document review period may be decreased from the FFA 60-day duration to a 30-day period for the secondary documents listed below:

- Treatability Study Work Plan
- Treatability Study Report
- Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis Report
- Removal Action Memorandum

These secondary documents are expected to be short in length and relatively straightforward in nature compared to the other primary and secondary documents.

5.1.2 Document Preparation, Field Investigation, and Sample Analysis/Validation Assumptions

Durations for work plan preparation and field investigation activities have been based on the available information for the sites, while taking into account the overall complexity of each area (e.g., size, media types, potential receptors, proximity to other sites). The sampling efforts needed to support RI/FS activities (i.e., required to fill existing risk-, hydrogeologic-, and engineering-related data gaps) also were taken into account. These factors will be more thoroughly evaluated during development of the work plans.

Work Plan development, field investigation, and sample analysis/validation activities for the sites and SSAs have been combined to optimize coordination of these efforts (e.g., document review, field mobilization/demobilization, database management). The site/SSA groupings and estimated work plan (both RI and SSP) and field investigation durations are summarized in Table 5-3.

The work plan durations represent the estimated time required to generate the first draft document (referred to as the Preliminary Draft). The field investigation durations include the time required for subcontractor procurement and mobilization of equipment and personnel.

With respect to sample analysis, a 28-day duration is the contractual turnaround time for Naval Energy and Environmental Support Activity (NEESA-) approved laboratories. Thirty days, however, is a more realistic estimate for receipt of analytical data. Therefore, 30 days was assumed for receipt of all laboratory analyses. For data validation, a 14-day duration was assumed for all analytical data, which is also the standard turnaround time for the data validation firms currently under contract with Baker.

For preparation of other RI/FS and RD/RA documents, "typical" or "average" durations were assumed based on prior experience in preparing these reports. Assumptions concerning document preparation are outlined in Table 5-4. More accurate estimates of document preparation times can be made in subsequent SMPs as more data become available; estimates will be updated in each site-specific work plan.

5.2 <u>Site Management Plan Schedules</u>

This section presents the proposed activities and schedules for the sites and SSAs identified in Section 2.0 and prioritized in Section 4.0 of the SMP. Figure 5-1 presents the overall schedules for completion of activities FY 2000. Figure 5-2 presents schedules and deliverable dates for IR Program activities from FY 1997 through FY 1998. Appendix C presents the schedules for removal actions. Appendices D, E, F, and G presents detailed SMP schedules for RI/FS/RD activities funded (or to be funded) during FY 1995, FY 1996, FY 1997, and FY 1998. Appendix D also presents a detailed schedule for ongoing soil treatability study work.

The basic strategy employed during development of the SMP schedules was to overlap the RI/FS and RD/RA activities to the maximum extent practicable in order to compress the entire project schedule. The amount of overlap was based on the degree of dependency between the various tasks and documents and government agencies requested review times. Key dependencies and related assumptions are outlined below.

- Remedial Investigation: Preparation of the Preliminary Draft RI was assumed to start once all the analytical data are received prior to completion of data validation.
 Certain RI tasks can begin before the data are validated; to prevent duplication of effort, this overlap was assumed to be two weeks.
- Feasibility Study: Many FS tasks are dependent on the nature and extent of contamination which is determined in the RI document. Preparation of the Preliminary Draft FS was assumed to start upon submission of the Draft Final RI for those future sites which require an FS.

• Proposed Plan: Preparation of the Preliminary Draft Proposed Plan was assumed to start upon submission of the Draft Final FS. As comments are received from USEPA and the Commonwealth of Virginia on the FS, modifications to the PRAP will be made concurrently.

- Public Commend Period: The 45 day public comment period on the PRAP will begin when the final PRAP is submitted. Public comments on the PRAP can then be considered and addressed in the Responsiveness Summary section of the ROD.
- Record of Decision: Preparation of the ROD will begin upon submission of the Draft Final PRAP. The final ROD will incorporate all public comments received during the Public Comment Period.
- Remedial Design: The RD was assumed to start when the Draft Final ROD is submitted. Full scale preparation of the RD will; however, not begin until concurrence with the selected alternative(s) is obtained.

5.2.1 Proposed Removal Actions

There are no removal actions currently being performed.

5.2.2 RI/FS and RD/RA Schedules

The prioritization of remedial investigation activities at the 21 RI/FS sites and the site screening process activities at the 19 SSAs has been presented in Section 4.0. Appendix C through Appendix G present detailed schedules, including submittal deadlines and target dates, for the activities beginning in FY 1994 through FY 1998 through their completion. Table 5-5 presents primary and secondary deliverables by month.

5.2.3 Treatability Study Schedule

Treatability studies are currently being conducted for nitramine-contaminated soil present at Sites 6, 7, 9, and 19 to support selection of a remedial technology, should remedial action be required for

these and other explosives contaminated sites. The proposed schedule for treatability studies being conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station (WES) in Vicksburg, Mississippi is presented in Appendix D, Figure D-1. A Final Treatability Study Work Plan has been completed by WES and bench scale treatability study work (reporting phase) continues.

Treatability studies using white rot fungus also are being conducted by Mycotech Corporation beginning in FY 1995 and concluding in FY 1996. Schedules are, however, not currently available for this treatability study.

WES, Navy, USEPA Region III, and Baker personnel selected the following remediation technologies for investigation by WES using bench scale reactors:

- Anaerobic Bioslurry
- Anaerobic Biocell
- Aerobic Bioslurry
- Aerobic Biocell
- Slurry Oxidation (SlurOx)

The WES treatability study is divided into seven phases that entail soil sample selection and preparation (Phase I), microbial systems evaluation (Phase II), desorption enhancement evaluation using surfactants (Phase III), bioslurry bench studies and biocell bench studies (Phases IV and V), slurox bench studies (Phase VI) and report preparation (Phase VII). Phase I took approximately 2 months. Phases II and III were performed concurrently and took approximately 3 months to complete. Phase IV took an additional 6 months to complete. Phase V ran concurrently with Phase IV (approximately 7 to 8 months to complete). Phase VI was not conducted. Finally, Phase VII is currently being completed. WES submitted "draft" results in September and October 1996. Baker will prepare and submit the Treatability Study Report based on WES's findings.

WES provided monthly updates to the Navy during the bench scale treatability study. Baker will continue to compile the monthly progress reports and generate quarterly reports for USEPA Region III and Commonwealth of Virginia review while the treatability study is ongoing. Quarterly reports will allow for the evaluation of each technology and, should these technologies prove to be

effective, FS reports will be developed to implement one of the technologies. If one of the bioremediation technologies is selected as a remedial alternative for one of the explosives contaminated sites, a ROD will be developed that identifies one of the bioremediation technologies as the remedial alternative and a proven technology as a backup alternative. A pilot scale study for the selected technology will be proposed during the design phase and will be necessary to determine how bioremediation technologies may be affected by site specific conditions. To date, two technologies appear to be promising. One pilot study employing anaerobic biocell technology and proprietary J.R. SIMPLOT SABRE process with be initiated in late FY 1996. A second pilot study employing aerobic biocell technology, native consortia, surfactant and molasses as a carbon source may be initiated by LANTDIV/WES in FY 1997. The latter technology is still in the early conceptual stage, but was the most efficient technology at the bench-scale level. Sites for which bioremediation technologies will be proposed first include Sites 6, 7, 9, and 19. FS reports for Sites 6 and 7, and 9 and 19 closely coincide with the issuance of the WES draft treatability study report in 1996.

1 1

5.2.4 Presumptive Remedies

Presumptive remedies are preferred technologies for common categories of sites based on historical patterns of remedy selection and USEPA's scientific and engineering evaluation of performance data on technology implementation. The objective of presumptive remedies is to use past agency experience to streamline site investigation and speed up selection of cleanup actions by eliminating the need for the initial identification and screening of alternatives during the FS.

Presumptive remedies evolve from the expectation that containment will be the likely focus at sites having wastes that pose relatively low, long-term threats or where treatment is impracticable. Presumptive remedies typically apply to municipal and CERCLA landfills as types of sites where treatment of the waste may be impractical because of their size and the heterogeneity of their contents.

Several sites at WPNSTA, Yorktown could potentially be candidate sites for presumptive remedies. These sites include Site 1, the former Dudley Road Landfill; and Site 2, the Former Turkey Road Landfill.

The potential use of a presumptive remedy at these sites also will be evaluated in FY 1997 or FY 1998 as RI/FS efforts are completed and receive agency approval.

SECTION 5.0 TABLES

TABLE 5-1 PRIMARY AND SECONDARY DOCUMENTS AS DEFINED IN THE FFA NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Primary Documents	Secondary Documents
Site Screening Process Work Plans	Health and Safety Plans
Site Screening Process Reports	Non-Time Critical Removal Action Plans
RI/FS and FFS Work Plans	Pilot/Treatability Study Work Plans
Remedial Investigation Reports	Pilot/Treatability Study Reports
FS and FFS Reports	N/A
Proposed Plans	Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis Reports
	Well Closure Methods and Procedures
Final Remedial Designs	N/A
Remedial Action Work Plans Remedial Action Sampling Plan Remedial Action Construction Quality Assurance Plan Remedial Action Environmental Monitoring Plan	Preliminary Conceptual Design or Equivalent Documents
Remedial Action Completion Reports	Prefinal Remedial Designs
Operation and Maintenance Plans	Periodic Review Assessment Reports
Site Management Plan	Removal Action Memorandums
Community Relations Plan (for submission only)	N/A
Long-Term Remedial Action Monitoring Plan (for submission only)	N/A

Notes:

Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Focused Feasibility Study RI/FS

FFS

N/A Not Applicable

TABLE 5-2

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY DOCUMENT REVIEW PROCESS
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Primary Document	Review Duration	Secondary Document	Review Duration
Draft Document	60 Days	Draft Document	60 Days
Incorporation of Comments	60 Days *	Incorporation of Comments	30 Days
Draft Final Document	30 Days **	N/A	
Final Document		Final Document	

N/A Not Applicable

- * Although the FFA provides 60 days for the incorporation of comments on draft documents, schedules presented herein provide 30 days. Thirty days is considered to be sufficient for incorporation of EPA/State comments.
- ** If comments are adequately addressed in the draft final document, the final document will be submitted one week following receipt of USEPA's and Commonwealth of Virginia's "No additional comments at this time" letter.

TABLE 5-3

ESTIMATED WORK PLAN AND FIELD INVESTIGATION DURATIONS FOR SITES AND SSAS NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Site No.	Work Plan Duration (Months)	Field Investigation (Months)	SSA No.	Work Plan Duration (Months)	Field Investigation (Months)
6, 7, 12, 16, SSA 16	2	5	1,6,7,15	1.5	1.5
9, 19	2	2	2, 17, 18, 19	1.5	1.5
1,3	2	1.5	8, 11, 12, 13	1	1.5
4,21,22	2	1.5	3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 20, 21 22, 23, and 24	2	2
11,17	2	1.5			
2, 8, 18 SSA 14	2	1.5			
23, 24, 25, 26	2	1			

.

TABLE 5-4

DOCUMENT PREPARATION DURATIONS
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Document	Duration (Months) ⁽¹⁾
Site Screening Area Report	2
Remedial Investigation Report	2
Feasibility Study	2
Proposed Plan	2
Record of Decision	1
Draft Remedial Design/Work Plan	5
Prefinal Remedial Design/Work Plan	2
Final Design/Work Plan	2
Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis	2
Removal Action Memorandum	1
30% Removal Action Design	1
90% Removal Action Design	2
Final Removal Action Design	1
Treatability Study Work Plan	2
Treatability Study Report	3

Note:

Durations represent estimated time required to complete Preliminary
Draft Documents

TABLE 5-5

FINAL 1997/1998 SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY DELIVERABLES BY MONTH WPNSTA YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Anticipated Submittal Date	CTO Number	Sites/SSAs	Deliverable	Document Submittal	EPA/State Review Complete By
May 31, 1996	319	Sites 6 & 7	RI/FS	Draft RI	December 2, 1996
June 5, 1996	334	Sites 9 & 19	RI/FS	Draft Final RI	December 2, 1996
June 28, 1996	334	Sites 9 & 19	RI/FS	Draft FS	December 30, 1996
June 29, 1996	318	Sites 1 & 3	RI/FS	Draft RI	December 18, 1996
July 5, 1996	334	Sites 9 & 19	RI/FS	Draft PRAP	April 30, 1997
July 31, 1996	318	Sites 1 & 3	RI/FS	Draft PRAP	December 27, 1996
August 1, 1996 August 23, 1996 August 29, 1996 August 30, 1996 August 30, 1996	320 319 318 319 363	SSAs 8, 11, 12, 13 Sites 6 & 7 Sites 1 & 3 Sites 6 & 7 Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14	Site Screening Process RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS Work Plan	Draft SSP Report Preliminary Draft FS (LANTDIV only) Preliminary Draft ROD Meeting (LANTDIV only) Preliminary Draft PRAP (LANTDIV only) Draft Work Plan	December 30, 1996 September 23, 1996 NA September 30, 1996 October 18, 1996
September 12, 1996	351	NA	Site Management Plan	Draft Final 97/98 SMP	October 14, 1996
September 12, 1996	311	Site 12	RI/FS	Final ROD	October 3, 1996
September 20, 1996	354	Sites 11 & 17	Work Plan	Draft Final Work Plan	October 23, 1996
September 23, 1996	349	Sites 4,21,22	Work Plan	Draft Final Work Plan	October 23, 1996
October 24, 1996	311	Site 12	RI/FS	Revised Final ROD	December 10, 1996
October 28, 1996	362	Site 12	Remedial Design	Draft Design (60%)	December 26, 1996
November 12, 1996	363	Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14	Work Plan	Draft Final Work Plan	December 2, 1996
November 22, 1996	354	Sites 11 & 17	Work Plan	Final Work Plan	NA
November 22, 1996	349	Sites 4,21,22	Work Plan	Final Work Plan	NA
December 31, 1996	363	Sites 2,8,18, and SSA 14	Work Plan	Final Work Plan	NA
January 9, 1997 January 13, 1997 January 13, 1997 January 17, 1997 January 17, 1997 January 20, 1997 January 27, 1997 January 27, 1997 January 29, 1997 January 30, 1997 January 30, 1997	311 209 319 318 351 319 318 362 320 35	Site 12 NA Sites 6 & 7 Sites 1 & 3 NA Sites 6 & 7 Sites 1 & 3 Site 12 SSAs 8,11,12, and 13 Sites 23,24,25,26,SSAs 3,4,5,9,10,20,21,22,23,24 Sites 9 & 19	RI/FS Treatability Study RI/FS RI/FS Site Management Plan RI/FS RI/FS Remedial Design Site Screening Process Work Plan RI/FS	Updated Revised Final ROD Preliminary Draft Treatability Study (LANTDIV) Draft Final RI Draft Final RI Final 97/98 SMP Draft FS Draft Final PRAP Pre-Final Design (100%) Draft Final SSP Preliminary Draft Work Plan (LANTDIV only) Final RI	NA February 12, 1997 February 12, 1997 February 17, 1997 NA March 21, 1997 February 26, 1997 February 26, 1997 February 28, 1997 March 3, 1997 NA
February 10, 1997	319	Sites 6 & 7	RI/FS	Draft PRAP Draft ROD Draft Final FS	April 11, 1997
February 26, 1997	318	Sites 1 & 3	RI/FS		April 28, 1997
February 28, 1997	334	Sites 9 & 19	RI/FS		March 28, 1997

TABLE 5-5 (Continued)

FINAL 1997/1998 SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY DELIVERABLES BY MONTH WPNSTA YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Anticipated Submittal Date	CTO Number	Sites/SSAs	Deliverable	Document Submittal	EPA/State Review Complete By
March 14, 1997 March 14, 1997 March 19, 1997 March 28, 1997 March 28, 1997 March 28, 1997 March 31, 1997	209 319 318 349 362 318 320	NA Sites 6 & 7 Sites 1 & 3 Sites 4,21,22 Site 12 Sites 1 & 3 SSAs 8,11,12, and 13	Treatability Study RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS Remedial Design RI/FS Site Screening Process	Draft Treatability Study Final RI Final RI Preliminary Draft RI (LANTDIV only) Final Design Final PRAP Final SSP	May 13, 1997 NA NA April 28, 1997 April 11, 1997 NA NA
April 2, 1997 April 15, 1997 April 19, 1997 April 21, 1997 April 28, 1997	35 36 354 319 334	Sites 23,24,25,26,SSAs 3,4,5,9,10,20,21,22,23,24 NA Sites 11 & 17 Sites 6 & 7 Sites 9 & 19	Work Plan Site Management Plan RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS	Draft Work Plan Preliminary Draft 98/99 SMP (LANTDIV only) Preliminary Draft RI (LANTDIV only) Draft Final FS Final FS	June 2, 1997 May 15, 1997 May 20, 1997 May 21, 1997 NA
May 10, 1997 May 28, 1997 May 28, 1997 May 30, 1997	319 349 318 334	Sites 6 & 7 Sites 4,21,22 Sites 1 & 3 Sites 9 & 19	RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS	Draft Final PRAP Draft RI Draft Final ROD Draft Final PRAP	June 10, 1997 July 28, 1997 June 27, 1997 June 30, 1997
June 9, 1997 June 12, 1997 June 14, 1997 June 18, 1997 June 19, 1997 June 20, 1997 June 30, 1997	319 209 36 363 354 319 334	Sites 6 & 7 NA NA Sites 2,8,18 and SSA 14 Sites 11 & 17 Sites 6 & 7 Sites 9 & 19	RI/FS Treatability Study Site Management Plan RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS	Preliminary Draft ROD (LANTDIV only) Final Treatability Study Draft 98/99 SMP Preliminary Draft RI (LANTDIV only) Draft RI Final FS Preliminary Draft ROD (LANTDIV only)	July 9, 1997 NA August 15, 1997 July 18, 1997 August 19, 1997 NA July 30, 1997
July 2, 1997 July 10, 1997 July 30, 1997	35 319 334	Sites 23,24,25,26,SSAs 3,4,5,9,10,20,21,22,23,24 Sites 6 & 7 Sites 9 & 19	Work Plan RI/FS RI/FS	Draft Final Work Plan Final PRAP Final PRAP	August 1, 1997 NA NA
August 8, 1997 August 18, 1997 August 27, 1997 August 29, 1997	319 363 349 334	Sites 6 & 7 Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14 Sites 4, 21, 22 Sites 9 & 19	RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS	Draft ROD Draft RI Draft Final RI Draft ROD	October 7, 1997 October 17, 1997 September 26, 1997 September 29, 1997
September 2, 1997 September 16, 1997 September 18, 1997	35 36 354	Sites 23,24,25,26,SSAs 3,4,5,9,10,20,21,22,23,24 NA Sites 11 & 17	Work Plan Site Management Plan RI/FS	Final Work Plan Draft Final 98/99 SMP Draft Final RI	NA October 16, 1997 October 18, 1997

TABLE 5-5 (Continued)

FINAL 1997/1998 SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY DELIVERABLES BY MONTH WPNSTA YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Anticipated Submittal Date	CTO Number	Sites/SSAs	Deliverable	Document Submittal	EPA/State Review Complete By
October 27, 1997 October 27, 1996 October 29, 1997	349 349 334	Sites 4,21,22 Sites 4,21,22 Sites 9 & 19	RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS	Final RI Preliminary Draft FS (LANTDIV only) Draft Final ROD	NA November 26, 1997 November 28, 1997
November 6, 1997 November 17, 1997 November 17, 1997 November 18, 1997	319 354 363 354	Sites 6 & 7 Sites 11 & 17 Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14 Sites 11 & 17	RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS	Draft Final ROD Preliminary Draft FS (LANTDIV only) Draft Final RI Final RI	December 8, 1997 December 17, 1997 December 17, 1997 NA
December 26, 1997 December 29, 1997	349 334	Sites 4,21,22 Sites 9 & 19	RI/FS RI/FS	Draft FS Final ROD	February 27, 1998 NA
January 5, 1998 January 7, 1998 January 15, 1997 January 16, 1998 January 16, 1998 January 16, 1998 January 23, 1998	319 36 354 363 363 363 35	Sites 9 & 19 Sites 6 & 7 NA Sites 11 & 17 Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14 Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14 Sites 23,24,25,26	Remedial Design RI/FS Site Management Plan RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS	Draft Design (60%) Final ROD Final 98/99 SMP Draft FS Preliminary Draft FS (LANTDIV only) Final RI Preliminary Draft RI (LANTDIV only)	March 6, 1998 NA NA March 17, 1998 February 16, 1998 NA February 23, 1998
February 23, 1998 February 25, 1998	35	SSAs 3,4,5,9,10,20,21,22,23,24 Sites 1 & 3	Site Screening Process Remedial Design	Preliminary Draft SSP (LANTDIV only) Draft Design (60%)	March 25, 1998 April 28, 1998
March 18, 1998 March 25, 1998 March 30, 1998	363 35 349	Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14 Sites 23,24,25,26 Sites 4,21,22	RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS	Draft FS Draft RI Draft Final FS	May 18, 1998 May 25, 1998 April 29, 1998
April 16, 1998 April 24, 1998	354 35	Sites 11 & 17 SSAs 3,4,5,9,10,20,21,22,23,24	RI/FS Site Screening Process	Draft Final FS Draft SSP	May 18, 1998 June 23, 1998
May 5, 1998 May 29, 1998 May 29, 1998	349 349	Sites 9 & 19 Sites 4,21,22 Sites 4,21,22	RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS	Pre-Final Design (100%) Preliminary Draft PRAP (LANTDIV only) Final FS	July 6, 1998 June 29, 1998 NA
June 15, 1998 June 17, 1998 June 17, 1998 June 24, 1998 June 27, 1998	354 363 354 35	Sites 11 & 17 Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14 Sites 11 & 17 Sites 23,24,25,26 Sites 1 & 3	RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS RI/FS Remedial Design	Preliminary Draft PRAP (LANTDIV only) Draft Final FS Final FS Draft Final RI Pre-Final Design (100%)	July 15, 1998 July 17, 1998 NA July 24, 1998 August 26, 1998
July 23, 1998 July 29, 1998	35 349	SSAs 3,4,5,9,10,20,21,22,23,24 Sites 4 21 22	Site Screening Process RI/FS	Draft Final SSP Draft PRAP	August 24, 1998 September 28, 1998

TABLE 5-5 (Continued)

FINAL 1997/1998 SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY DELIVERABLES BY MONTH WPNSTA YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Anticipated Submittal Date	CTO Number	Sites/SSAs	Deliverable	Document Submittal	EPA/State Review Complete By
August 14, 1998	354	Sites 11 & 17	RI/FS	Draft PRAP Preliminary Draft PRAP (LANTDIV only) Final FS Final RI	October 13, 1998
August 17, 1998	363	Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14	RI/FS		September 16, 1998
August 17, 1998	363	Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14	RI/FS		NA
August 24, 1998	35	Sites 23,24,25,26	RI/FS		NA
September 4, 1998 September 23, 1998 September 23, 1998	35 35	Sites 9 & 19 Sites 23,24,25,26 SSAs 3,4,5,9,10,20,21,22,23,24	Remedial Design RI/FS Site Screening Process	Final Design Preliminary Draft FS (LANTDIV only) Final SSP	September 21, 1998 October 23, 1998 NA
October 16, 1998	363	Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14	RI/FS	Draft PRAP	December 15, 1998
October 27, 1998	-	Sites 1 & 3	Remedial Design	Final Design	November 11, 1998
October 28, 1998	349	Sites 4,21,22	RI/FS	Draft Final PRAP	November 27, 1998
November 12, 1998	354	Sites 11 & 17	RI/FS	Draft Final PRAP Draft FS Preliminary Draft ROD (LANTDIV only)	December 14, 1998
November 23, 1998	35	Sites 23,24,25,26	RI/FS		January 22, 1999
November 27, 1998	349	Sites 4,21,22	RI/FS		December 28, 1998
December 14, 1998	354	Sites 11 & 17	RI/FS	Preliminary Draft ROD (LANTDIV only) Final PRAP	January 13, 1999
December 28, 1998	349	Sites 4,21,22	RI/FS		NA
January 13, 1999	354	Sites 11 & 17	RI/FS	Final PRAP	NA
January 14, 1999	363	Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14	RI/FS	Draft Final PRAP	February 15, 1999
January 27, 1999	349	Sites 4,21,22	RI/FS	Draft ROD	March 29, 1999
February 15, 1999	363	Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14	RI/FS	Preliminary Draft ROD (LANTDIV only) Draft ROD Draft Final FS	March 17, 1999
February 12, 1999	354	Sites 11 & 17	RI/FS		April 13, 1999
February 22, 1999	35	Sites 23,24,25,26	RI/FS		March 24, 1999
March 17, 1999	363	Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14	RI/FS	Final PRAP	NA
April 16, 1999	363	Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14	RI/FS	Draft ROD	June 15, 1999
April 23, 1999	35	Sites 23,24,25,26	RI/FS	Final FS	NA
April 28, 1999	349	Sites 4,21,22	RI/FS	Draft Final ROD	May 28, 1999
May 13, 1999	354	Sites 11 & 17	RI/FS	Draft Final ROD Preliminary PRAP (LANTDIV only)	June 14, 1999
May 24, 1999	35	Sites 23,24,25,26	RI/FS		June 23, 1999
July 14, 1999	354	Sites 11 & 17	RI/FS	Final ROD	NA
July 15, 1999	363	Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14	RI/FS	Draft Final ROD	August 16, 1999
July 23, 1999	35	Sites 23,24,25,26	RI/.FS	Draft PRAP	September 21, 9999
September 14, 1999	363	Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14	RI/FS	Final ROD	NA
September 27, 1999	318	Sites 1 & 3	RI/FS	Final ROD	NA
September 30, 1999	-	Sites 4,21,22	Remedial Design	Draft Design (60%)	November 29, 1999

TABLE 5-5 (Continued)

FINAL 1997/1998 SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY DELIVERABLES BY MONTH WPNSTA YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Anticipated Submittal Date	CTO Number	Sites/SSAs	Deliverable	Document Submittal	EPA/State Review Complete By
October 14, 1999	35-	Sites 11 & 17	Remedial Design	Draft Design (60%)	December 13, 1999
October 21, 1999		Sites 23,24,25,26	RI/FS	Draft Final PRAP	November 22, 1999
December 13, 1999	35-	Site 2	Remedial Design	Draft Design (60%)	February 11, 2000
December 22, 1999		Sites 23,24,25,26	RI/FS	Final PRAP	NA
January 7, 2000 January 21, 2000 January 28, 2000	35	Sites 8 & 18 Sites 23,24,25,26 Sites 4,21,22	Remedial Design RI/FS Remedial Design	Draft Design (60%) Preliminary Draft ROD (LANTDIV only) Pre-Final Design (100%)	March 7, 2000 February 21, 2000 March 28, 2000
February 11, 2000	-	Sites 11 & 17	Remedial Design	Pre-Final Design (100%)	April 11, 2000
March 22, 2000	35	Sites 23,24,25,26	RI/.FS	Draft ROD	May 22, 2000
April 11, 2000	-	Site 2	Remedial Design	Pre-Final Design (100%)	June 12, 2000
May 8, 2000	-	Sites 8 & 18	Remedial Design	Pre-Final Design (100%)	July 7, 2000
May 29, 2000		Sites 4,21,22	Remedial Design	Final Design	June 13, 2000
June 12, 2000	35-	Sites 11 & 17	Remedial Design	Final Design	June 27, 2000
June 21, 2000		Sites 23,24,25,26	RI/FS	Draft Final ROD	July 21, 2000
August 11, 2000	35-	Site 2	Remedial Design	Final Design	August 28, 2000
August 21, 2000		Sites 23,24,25,26	RI/FS	Final ROD	NA
September 5, 2000	349-	Sites 8 & 18	Remedial Design	Final Design	September 20, 2000
September 29, 2000		Sites 4,21,22	RI/FS	Final ROD	NA

Notes:


CTO = Contract Task Order. Deliverables having CTO numbers are funded.


FS = Feasibility Study NA = Not Applicable

PRAP = Proposed Remedial Action Plan

RI = Remedial Investigation
ROD = Record of Decision
SMP = Site Management Plan
SSA = Site Screening Area
SSP = Site Screening Process

SECTION 5.0 FIGURES





6.0 REFERENCES

I = I

Baker Environmental, Inc. 1995. <u>Final Assessment Report for Site Screening Area 12</u>, <u>Proposed Location of P-518</u>, <u>Automotive Vehicle Maintenance Shop</u>, <u>Naval Weapons Station Yorktown</u>, <u>Yorktown</u>, <u>Virginia</u>. September, 1995.

Baker Environmental, Inc. and Roy F. Weston, Inc. 1993a. <u>Final Round one Remedial Investigation</u>, Sites 1-9, 11, 12, 16-19, and 21, Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, <u>Virginia</u>. July 1993.

Baker Environmental, Inc. and Roy F. Weston, Inc. 1993b. <u>Focused Biological Sampling and Preliminary Risk Evaluation</u>, Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia. April 1993.

Baker Environmental, Inc. and Roy F. Weston, Inc. 1992. <u>Draft Final Site Inspection Report</u>, <u>Site 21</u>, <u>Battery and Drum Disposal Area, Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia</u>. February 1992.

C.C. Johnson & Associates, Inc. and CH2M Hill. 1984. <u>Initial Assessment Study of Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia</u>. July 1984.

Dames & Moore. 1989. <u>Draft Remedial Investigation Interim Report, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia</u>. February 1989.

Dames & Moore. 1988. <u>Confirmation Study Step 1A (Verification)</u>, Round Two, Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia. June 1988.

Dames & Moore. 1986. <u>Confirmation Study Step 1A (Verification)</u>, Round One, Naval Weapons <u>Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia</u>. June 1986.

Department of Defense. 1996. <u>Relative Risk Site Evaluation Primer (Revised Edition)</u>. Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Environmental Security). Summer 1996.

Department of the Navy. 1991. <u>Master Plan, U.S. Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia</u>.

1 1

ENSCI Environmental, Inc. 1995. <u>Closure Report, Naval Weapons Station, Building 1816 Otto</u> <u>Fuel Tank and Sump, Yorktown, Virginia.</u> May 1995

Environmental Safety Consultants, Inc. 1995. <u>Removal Action Waste Otto Fuel Tank Closure Report, MK-46 Torpedo Shop, Building 1456, Site Screening Area 17, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.</u> June 1995.

International Technology (IT) Corporation. 1995. <u>Final Closeout Report for Sites 4, 16, and 21</u> Battery and Drum Disposal Area, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia. June 1995.

International Technology (IT) Corporation. 1995. Final Closeout Report for Sites 2, 9, and SSA 4. Minecasing and Debris Removal Action, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia. October 1995.

Kearney/Centaur Division. 1992. <u>RCRA Solid Waste Management Unit Investigation, Naval Weapons Station - Yorktown</u>. December 1992.

OHM Remedial Services Corporation. 1996. <u>Draft Final Removal Action at Site Screening Areas</u> 3 and 7, Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia. November 1996.

OHM Remedial Services Corporation. 1996. <u>Final Report for Soil and Debris Removal Action at Site Screening Areas 1, 2, and 5, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia</u>. January 1996.

United States Environmental Protection Agency. 1994a. <u>Preliminary Remediation Goals, First Half</u> 1994. Region IX, San Francisco, California.

United States Environmental Protection Agency. 1994b. <u>Federal Facility Agreement for Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia</u>. September 1994.

United States Environmental Protection Agency. 1992a. <u>RCRA Solid Waste Management Unit Investigation, Naval Weapons Station - Yorktown</u>. Submitted by Kearney/Centaur Division, A. T. Kearney, Inc. New York, New York. December 1992.

1 - 1

United States Environmental Protection Agency. 1992b. <u>Study Area Analysis</u>, <u>Yorktown Naval Weapons Station</u>, <u>Yorktown</u>, <u>Virginia</u>. <u>Volume 1</u>. Environmental Monitoring Systems Laboratory, Office of Research and Development. Las Vegas, Nevada. November 1992.

United States Environmental Protection Agency. 1989. <u>Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund</u>, <u>Volume 1, Human Health Assessment Manual (Part A) Interim Final</u>. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. Washington, D.C. EPA/540/1-89-002.

United States Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic Division. 1995. <u>Relative Risk Site Evaluation System Users Manual</u>. May 1995.

Versar. 1991. Remedial Investigation Interim Report, Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia. July 1991.

APPENDIX A
SITE RANKING PROCESS AND RESULTS
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

APPENDIX A-1
QUANTITATIVE SITE RANKING PROCESS
AND RESULTS FY 1993 - FY 1995
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

APPENDIX A-1

QUANTITATIVE SITE RANKING NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A-la	Site 1- Dudley Road Landfill
A-lb	Site 2 - Turkey Road Landfill
A-1c	Site 3 - Group 16 Magazine Landfill
A-1d	Site 4 - Burning Pad Residue Landfill
A-le	Site 5 - Surplus Transformer Storage Area
A-lf	Site 6 - Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Impoundment
A-1g	Site 7 - Plant 3 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area
A-lh	Site 8 - NEDED Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Are
A-li	Site 9 - Plant 1 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area
A-1j	Site 11 - Abandoned Explosives Burning Pits
A-1k	Site 12 - Barracks Road Landfill
A-11	Site 16 - West Road Landfill
A-lm	Site 17 - Holm Road Landfill
A-ln	Site 18 - Building 476 Discharge Area
A-lo	Site 19 - Conveyor Belt Soils at Building 10
A-lp	Site 21 - Battery and Drum Disposal Area

A.0 SITE RANKING

The site ranking methodology has been developed to rank sites so that the worst sites, as defined by the greatest detected concentration of specific compounds (usually based on a limited amount of data), in conjunction with the compounds' toxicity, potential for human and/or ecological exposure, and potential for contaminant migration, are prioritized. This ranking methodology is a site management tool to indicate, by actual media concentrations, toxicity, potential exposure, and potential migration, which sites may pose the greatest risk to human health and/or the environment and focus study and remediation on these sites. The methodology is both quantitative and qualitative in nature, as presented in the following sections. For SSAs that have no chemical data, those closest to the boundary of the facility will be studied first to ensure that any potential off-Station contaminant migration is identified and treated, as appropriate. These areas will undergo the Site Screening Process (as defined in the FFA, Subsection 9.3). Figure 4-1 presents the points at which decisions will be made to determine the fate of each SSA (i.e., whether an RI/FS will be performed on the area, or whether the area does not pose a threat to public health, welfare, or the environment and, therefore, should be removed from further study).

A.1 Site Ranking - Quantitative Analysis

For the quantitative screening analysis, human health was evaluated by assuming that groundwater was used as tap water (both ingestion and inhalation exposure scenarios were included in the tap water determination) and soil contact was assumed to be residential (including both ingestion and dermal contact scenarios), as described in the USEPA Region IX Preliminary Remediation Goal (PRG) values (USEPA Region IX, updated biannually) (USEPA, 1994). Ecological risk was determined for the aquatic environment only (surface water and sediment), since benchmark values for terrestrial ecological risk are not readily available. Note that surface water has not been considered as tap water in the screening methodology because; 1) surface water is almost exclusively treated before use, 2) significant dilution occurs between source and intake, and 3) surface water in the vicinity of the majority of Navy sites is brackish.

To initially rank the sites, Contaminant Hazard Factors (CHFs) for human health (carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic) and ecological risk were calculated. These CHF values were determined by dividing the maximum detected concentration of particular compounds in the environmental media (soil,

groundwater, surface water and/or sediment) by the corresponding, most recent USEPA Region IX PRG value, Federal Ambient Water Quality Criteria (AWQC), and/or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) sediment screening value. This Appendix presents the ratios calculated for each sampled environmental medium at each of the 16 original sites at WPNSTA Yorktown.

Equations for these calculations are as follows:

Human Contaminant Hazard Factor Calculation - Groundwater

Carcinogens

Noncarcinogens

 $CHF_{gwc} = \sum (C_{max} / PRG)$

 $CHF_{gwnc} = \sum (C_{max} / PRG)$

where: CHF_{gwc} = Contaminant Hazard Factor, sum of groundwater carcinogenic ratios

 C_{max} = Maximum detected concentration (microgram per liter [$\mu g/L$])

PRG = USEPA Region IX tap water PRG (μ g/L)

CHF_{gwnc} = Contaminant Hazard Factor, sum of groundwater noncarcinogenic

ratios

Human Contaminant Hazard Factor Calculation - Soil

Carcinogens

Noncarcinogens

 $CHF_{ssc} = \sum (C_{max} / PRG)$

 $CHF_{ssnc} = \sum (C_{max} / PRG)$

where: CHF_{ssc} = Contaminant Hazard Factor, sum of surface soil carcinogenic ratios

C_{max} = Maximum detected concentration (milligram per kilogram [mg/kg])

PRG = USEPA Region IX residential soil PRG (mg/kg)

CHF_{ssnc} = Contaminant Hazard Factor, sum of surface soil noncarcinogenic ratios

Ecological Contaminant Hazard Factor Calculation - Surface Water/Sediment

Surface Water

Sediment

 $CHF_{sw} = \sum (C_{maxsw} / AWQC)$

 $CHF_{sd} = \sum (C_{maxsd} / NOAA)$

where: CHF_{sw} = Contaminant Hazard Factor, sum of surface water ratios

C_{maxsw} = Maximum detected concentration surface water (μg/L)

AWQC = Federal Ambient Water Quality Criteria (μg/L)

CHF_{sd} = Contaminant Hazard Factor, sum of sediment ratios

C_{maxed} = Maximum detected concentration sediment (mg/kg)

NOAA = Sediment screening value (mg/kg)

A.2 Site Ranking - Qualitative Analysis

Once the quantitative assessment was complete, a qualitative assessment addressing potential exposure and potential migration was performed. This analysis was conducted to ensure that where human and/or ecological exposure to the contaminated media exists and the potential for contaminant migration is high, these sites are investigated before sites with less potential to impact human health and the environment. This analysis was performed by asking and answering four questions regarding the potential receptors at a site and four questions regarding potential contaminant migration (the migration question was the same question asked for each environmental media: groundwater, surface soil, surface water, and sediment). Table A-1 summarizes the initial ratios calculated and the answers to the qualitative questions.

A.2.1 Receptor Factor

The Receptor Factor (RF) was used to identify the actual and/or potentially exposed human and ecological populations at each site. The RF was determined for each of the four environmental media for which data were collected.

A.2.1.1 Groundwater

For human receptors potentially exposed to contaminated groundwater, one of the following three statements was selected to represent conditions at a particular site:

- a) Groundwater is currently used for human activities (i.e., drinking, agriculture, recreation).
- b) Groundwater is not currently used for human activities (i.e., drinking, agriculture, recreation), but may be in the future.
- c) In the future groundwater will not be used for human activities (i.e., drinking, agriculture, recreation) because of high salinity, chlorides, total suspended solids, etc.

A.2.1.2 Surface Soil

For human receptors potentially exposed to contaminated surface soil, one of the following three statements was selected to represent conditions at a particular site:

- a) There are sensitive receptors (i.e., children, elderly, hospital patients, pregnant women) present in the area and/or the area is routinely used by non-sensitive receptors (i.e., workers, individuals undergoing training).
- b) Sensitive receptors (i.e., children, elderly, hospital patients, pregnant women) may be to be present in the area and/or the area is occasionally used by non-sensitive receptors (i.e., workers, individuals undergoing training).
- c) Sensitive receptors (i.e., children, elderly, hospital patients, pregnant women) are not present in the area and/or the area is not used by non-sensitive receptors (i.e., workers, individuals undergoing training).

A.2.1.3 Surface Water

For aquatic ecological receptors potentially exposed to contaminated surface water, one of the following three statements was selected to represent conditions at a particular site:

- Habitats containing Federal and/or state threatened or listed endangered species,
 wetland areas, migratory bird habitats, etc. exist on or near the site.
- b) Habitats containing Federal and/or state threatened or listed endangered species, wetland areas, migratory bird habitats, etc. have not yet been identified on or near the site, but may be identified in the future.
- c) It is unlikely that habitats containing Federal and/or state threatened or listed endangered species, wetland areas, migratory bird habitats, etc. exist; or if they exist, are protected by natural conditions (e.g. hydraulic gradient, attenuation, dilution).

A.2.1.4 Sediment

For aquatic ecological receptors potentially exposed to contaminated sediment, one of the following three statements was selected to represent conditions at a particular site (these are the same statements used to represent the conditions for surface water receptors):

- a) Evidence exists that habitats containing Federal and/or state threatened or listed endangered species, wetland areas, migratory bird habitats, etc. exist on or are near the site.
- b) Habitats containing Federal and/or state threatened or listed endangered species, wetland areas, migratory bird habitats, etc. have not yet been identified on or near the site, but may be identified in the future.
- c) It is unlikely that habitats containing Federal and/or state threatened or listed endangered species, wetland areas, migratory bird habitats, etc. exist; or if they do exist, they are protected by natural conditions (e.g. hydraulic gradient, attenuation,

dilution).

A.2.2 Migration Pathway Factor

The Migration Pathway Factor (MPF) was used to identify the likelihood of off-site contaminant migration in any of the environmental media at the site. The MPF was determined for each media sampled at a particular site by selecting one of the following statements that applies to the sampled environmental media:

- a) There is physical evidence/analytical data indicating off-site contaminant migration.
- b) There is no current indication of off-site migration, but the potential for migration exists.
- e) Present engineering structures and/or physical/chemical properties of the detected constituents greatly restrict the potential for off-site migration.

A.2.3 Quantification of Qualitative Questions - Adjusted Ratios

Both the RF and the MPF were quantified to incorporate the results of the qualitative media evaluation by adjusting the media-specific CHF to account for the influence(s) of potential human and/or ecological receptors and potential contaminant migration. Table A-2 presents the adjusted risk ratios per sample media.

A.2.3.1 Quantification of Receptor Factor

The media-specific CHF was adjusted in the following manner to account for potential human and/or ecological receptors:

• If the selected response to the groundwater RF was (a) the carcinogenic CHF for groundwater multiplied by a factor of 100 and the noncarcinogenic CHF was multiplied by a factor of 10. If the selected response was (b) the carcinogenic CHF for groundwater was multiplied by a factor of 10 and the noncarcinogenic CHF was

multiplied by a factor of 5.

- If the selected response to the surface soil RF was (a) the carcinogenic CHF for surface soil was multiplied by a factor of 100 and the noncarcinogenic CHF was multiplied by a factor of 10. If the selected response was (b) the carcinogenic CHF for surface soil was multiplied by a factor of 10 and the noncarcinogenic CHF was multiplied by a factor of 5.
- If the selected response to the surface water RF was (a) the surface water CHF was multiplied by a factor of 10. If the selected response was (b) the surface water CHF was multiplied by a factor of 5.
- If the selected response to the sediment RF was (a) the sediment CHF was multiplied by a factor of 10. If the selected response was (b) the sediment CHF was multiplied by a factor of 5.

The carcinogenic multiplier of 100 was developed to account for the target risk range for carcinogens, between 1 x 10⁻⁴ and 1 x 10⁻⁶. The noncarcinogenic multiplier of 10 was developed using the uncertainty factor approach as defined in the USEPA's Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund (RAGS) (USEPA, 1989). The factor of 10 was used to account for different mechanisms of action and effects on differing organ systems by various chemicals. These factors were used to ensure that sites with a greater probability of actual human exposure would rank higher than those sites at which potential or no human contact is anticipated. The ecological multiplier of 10 was included to ensure that sites impacting Federal and/or state threatened or listed endangered species, wetlands, migratory bird habitats, etc. would have higher investigative priority than sites at which these habitats are not apparent (e.g., drainage ditches). The quantification values for RF responses of (b) were selected to give higher priority to those sites that have the potential to affect human health and the environment over sites that have little or no potential to affect human health or the environment.

A.2.3.2 Quantification of Migration Pathway Factor

The media-specific CHF was also adjusted to account for potential contaminant migration in the following manner:

- If the selected response to the groundwater MPF was (a), both the carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic CHF values for groundwater were multiplied by a factor of 10. If the selected response was (b), the carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic CHF values for groundwater were multiplied by a factor of 5.
- If the selected response to the surface soil MPF was (a), both the carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic CHF values for surface soil were multiplied by a factor of 10. If the selected response was (b), the carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic CHF values for surface soil were multiplied by a factor of 5.
- If the selected response to the surface water MPF was (a), the surface water CHF was
 multiplied by a factor of 10. If the selected response was (b), the surface water CHF
 was multiplied by a factor of 5.
- If the selected response to the sediment MPF was (a), the sediment CHF was multiplied by a factor of 10. If the selected response was (b), the sediment CHF was multiplied by a factor of 5.

These factors were chosen to increase the priority of those sites with evidence of, or the potential for, offsite contaminant migration, respectively.

A.3 Total Site Risk Screening Values

Table A-3 presents the summarized, adjusted risk ratios for carcinogenic, noncarcinogenic, and ecological risks at each of the 16 sites investigated in the Round One RI. Once the adjusted values for each media were determined, carcinogenic, noncarcinogenic, and ecological adjusted ratios across media were summed. That is:

- For human health, the adjusted carcinogenic values for groundwater and soil were added for a total site carcinogenic risk screening value.
- Also for human health, the adjusted noncarcinogenic values for groundwater and soil were added for a total site noncarcinogenic risk screening value.

For ecological risk, the adjusted surface water and sediment values were added to determine the total ecological risk screening value for each site.

For human health, the total site carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic risk screening values were determined in the following manner:

Human Health Risk Screening Value

Carcinogens

Noncarcinogens

 $RSV_c = Adj_{ewc} + Adj_{ewc}$

 $RSV_{nc} = Adj_{gwnc} + Adj_{ssnc}$

where: RSV_e = Total carcinogenic risk screening value (soil/groundwater)

Adj_{gwc} = Adjusted groundwater carcinogenic value

Adj = Adjusted surface soil carcinogenic value

RSV_{nc} = Total noncarcinogenic risk screening value (soil/groundwater)

Adj_{gwnc} = Adjusted groundwater noncarcinogenic value

Adj_{ssnc} = Adjusted surface soil noncarcinogenic value

For ecological risk, the total site risk screening value was determined in the following manner:

Ecological Risk Screening Value

 $RSV_{eco} = Adj_{sw} + Adj_{sd}$

where: RSV_{eco} = Total ecological risk screening value (surface water/sediment)

Adj_{sw} = Adjusted surface water value Adj. = Adjusted sediment value

A.4 Site Ranking Summary

These site risk screening values were then ranked with the lowest non-zero (or non "--") value in each category (i.e., the least potential risk) receiving a score of 1. Categories with no available data were not considered in the site ranking. In this case, that particular category was normalized to ensure that all three categories were evaluated on the same relative scale. To determine this normalization factor, the number of entries from the longest column was determined and designated "N_{max}". N_{max} was then divided by the number of entries in each of the other two columns to calculate the normalization factor for that category/column. Ranks within categories containing entries less than N_{max} were multiplied by the calculated normalization factor.

Once the ranks were normalized, the rank sum method was used to evaluate carcinogenic, noncarcinogenic, and ecological parameters together. Since these are distinctly different measurements, the actual ratios cannot be summed; rather the ranks were summed to allow for addition of unlike terms. The site with the highest sum of the normalized rank was then considered to be the worst site based on chemical concentration, toxicity, and exposure. Table A-4 lists the sites in order of rank on a worst-first priority basis.

A.5 Site and SSA Investigation Prioritization

With the exception of Site 22 (for which no analytical data are available), the above ranking system was used to aid in the prioritization of investigation activities at WPNSTA Yorktown within the SMP. Site 22 could potentially be a source of contamination to the unnamed stream which lies between Sites 4 and 21 and flows past Site 22. The unnamed stream flows into Felgates Creek. As a result, Site 22 was prioritized with Sites 4 and 21.

RI/FS report writing is currently underway for Sites 6, 7, and 12. These reports, generated during FY 1995, are, or will soon be under review by USEPA Region III and the Commonwealth of Virginia. A "No Further Remedial Action with Institutional Controls" ROD has been signed by all parties for Site 16/SSA 16. A Post Removal Confirmatory Sampling Report and Baseline Risk Assessment have been finalized for Sites 4 and 21. In addition to these activities, a work plan, the field investigation, RI/FS report writing, PRAP and ROD preparation for Sites 1, 3, 9 and 19 have been funded in FY 1995.

Site ranking (presented in Section A.4) and additional factors, such as current funding allocation, completion of removal actions, proximity of sites to one another, and sites having similar physical characteristics have been considered to prioritize the investigation of the remaining sites. The following list presents the order in which the sites currently are planned to be investigated during FY 1997 and FY 1998:

- Sites 1 and 3 Work Plan, Field Investigation, Round Two RI/FS reports (based on site ranking, proximity to one another, and proximity to Felgates Creek)
- Sites 4, 21, and 22 Work Plan, Field Investigation, Round Two RI/FS reports (based on the results, of the Round One RI, removal action confirmatory sampling results, and conclusions of the supplemental RI Report).
- Sites 11 and 17 Work Plan, Field Investigation, Round Two RI/FS reports (based on site ranking, proximity to one another, and proximity to Felgates Creek).
- Sites 2, 8, 18, and SSA 14 Work Plan, Field Investigation, Round Two RI/FS reports (based on site ranking, proximity to Felgates Creek, and physical similarities of these sites).
- Sites 23, 24, 25, and 26 Work Plan, Field Investigation, RI/FS Reports (based on the results of the SSP for SSAs 1, 6, 7, and 18).

Analytical data are available for SSAs 1, 2, 6, 7, 15, 17, 18, and 19. These SSAs have been subjected to the SSP. The SSAs which are to be retained for further investigation based on the outcome of the SSP (SSAs 1, 6, 7, and 18) will be ranked accordingly using the site ranking system. SSA 20 (Lee Pond) and SSA 21 (Roosevelt Pond) data also are available. Therefore, SSAs 20 and 21 also will be evaluated using site ranking even though the data have not been subjected to the SSP.

There are insufficient data to rank the remaining SSAs in the same manner as the IRP sites so SSAs closest to the border of the facility will be investigated first. The order for the SSA investigations is:

SSAs 8, 11, 12, and 13 - (SSA 12 soil investigated in 1994)

- SSA 20 and 21 SSAs 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 22, and 23

TABLE A-1

SUMMARY OF INITIAL RATIOS AND ANSWERS TO QUALITATIVE QUESTIONS SITES 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, AND 21 NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

SITE		Groundw	ater			So	il			Sediment		Su	rface Wate	er
NO.	CAR	NON	RF	MPF	CAR	NON	RF	MPF	ECO	RF	MPF	ECO	RF	MPF
1	7,293.33	17.30	С	а	24.50	0.37	b	С	13.14	а	ь	98.75	a	Ъ
2	2,437.02	14.05	С	ь					36.59	a	а	7.02	a	a
3	1,307,48	75.51	С	a	6.02	0.50	ъ	ь				1.00	a	ь
4	1,464.11	35.63	С	а	25.43	4.00	b	ь	681.62	а	а	543.58	а	a
5		**			14.00	**	ъ	С					••	
6	333.25	7.16	С	b	6.81	0.11	b	ь	44.57	а	а	47.13	а	ь
7	5,573.82	68.65	С	Ъ	4.12	0.47	ъ	b	23.58	а	b	67.70	а	b
8	313.20	8.83	С	Ъ	4.19	0.20	ь	ъ	15.48	a	ъ	10.49	а	ь
9	1,290.90	119.91	С	а	24.08	1.85	b	ь	296.06	a	ь	6.19	a	а
11	1,890.51	7.28	С	ъ		0.03	ь	ъ	1.20	а	ъ	238.40	a	ъ
12	34.18	29.55	С	a	52.90	6.26	ь	ъ	815.65	а	ъ	508.59	a	a
16	776.92	25.66	С	a	13.24	2.21	ь	b	6.55	а	b	391.05	a	ь
17	2,470.95	23.60	С	b	71.69	2.23	С	b	••					
18	378.67	74.62	С	c			ь	С	7.88	a	ъ	16.61	а	b
19	0.03	20.16	С	а	35.49	3.24	b	а	248.14	a	a			••
21	1,033.04	166.10	С	ь	31.11	4.30	а	ь						

Notes: CAR Carcinogenic values

NON Noncarcinogenic values

Ecological values -

RF Receptor factor

MPF Migration pathway factor

Not detected or not analyzed

a, b, c Defined on pages A-6 and A-7

ECO

12.50

TABLE A-2

ADJUSTED RISK RATIOS PER MEDIA SITES 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, AND 21 NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

SITE	Grou	ndwater	So	oil	Sediment	Surface Water
NO.	adj-CAR	adj-NON	adj-CAR	adj-NON	adj-ECO	adj-ECO
1	72,933.33	172.97	244.97	1.85	657.00	4,937.50
2	12,185.10	70.25			3,659.00	702.00
3	13,074.80	751.10	301.00	12.50		50.00
4	14,641.10	356.30	1,271.50	99.98	68,162.00	54,358.20
5			140.00			
6	1,666.25	35.80	340.50	2.75	4,457.20	2,356.50
7	27,869.10	343.25	206.15	11.75	1,178.75	3,385.35
8	1,566.02	44.15	209.65	5.10	774.05	524.25
9	12,908.96	1,199.10	1,204.20	46.25	14,802.80	619.00
11	9,452.55	36.40		0.75	60.00	11,919.85
12	341.80	295.50	2,645.20	156.50	40,782.50	50,859.30
16	7,769.20	256.60	661.85	55.25	327.50	19,552.40
17	12,354.75	117.99	358.45	11.15		
18	378.67	74.62		**	393.85	830.25
19	0.30	201.60	3,549.30	161.95	24,814.10	
21	5,165.20	830.48	15,555.00	215.00		

Notes: adj-CAR

adj-NON adj-ECO

Adjusted carcinogenic values Adjusted noncarcinogenic values

Adjusted ecological values

Not detected or not analyzed

TABLE A-3

SUMMARY OF TOTAL ADJUSTED RISK RATIOS SITES 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, AND 21 NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

SITE NUMBER	CARCINOGENS	NONCARCINOGENS	ECOLOGICAL
1	73,178	175	5,594
2	12.185	70	4,361
3	13,376	768	50
4	15,913	456	122,520
5	140		
6	2,007	39	6,814
7	28,075	355	4,564
8	1,776	49	1,298
9	14,113	1,245	15,422
11	9,453	37	11,980
12	2,987	452	91,642
16	8,431	312	19,880
17	12,713	129	
18	379	75	1,224
19	3,550	364	24,814
21	20,720	1,045	

Not detected or not analyzed

TABLE A-4

SITE RANKING SITES 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, AND 21 NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

	Ranking							
Site Number	CAR	Norm. CAR	NON	Norm. NON	ECO	Norm. ECO	Sum of Rank	Sites in Order of Rank
1	16	16	7	7	6	7	30	Site 4 (42)
2	9	9	4	4	4	5	18	Site 9 (39)
3	11	11	13	14	1	1	26	Site 12 (32)
4	13	13	12	13	13	16	42	Site 7 (31)
5	1	1		0		0	1	Site 19 (31)
6	4	4	2	2	7	9	15	Site 1 (30)
7	15	15	9	10	5	6	31	Site 21 (29)
8	3	3	3	3	3	4	10	Site 16 (28)
9	12	12	15	16	9	11	39	Site 3 (26)
11	8	8	1	1	8	10	19	Site 11 (19)
12	5	5	11	12	12	15	32	Site 2 (18)
16	7	7	8	9	10	12	28	Site 17 (16)
17	10	10	6	6		0	16	Site 6 (15)
18	2	2	5	5	2	2	9	Site 8 (10)
19	6	6	10	11	11	14	31	Site 18 (10)
21	14	14	14	15		0	29	Site 5 (1)

Notes:

CAR Ranking of carcinogenic scores
NON Ranking of noncarcinogenic scores

ECO Ranking of ecological scores

Norm. Normalized scores

Not detected or not analyzed

APPENDIX A-1a SITE 1 - DUDLEY ROAD LANDFILL NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 1 - Dudley Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Trichloroethane, 1, 1, 2-	28	0.3	93.33
Trichloroethene	18,000	2.5	7,200.00
TOTAL			7,293.33
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	10,500	36,500	0.29
Cadmium	5.9	18.3	0.32
Dichloroethene,1,2-	1,000	69.2	14.45
Manganese	355	182.5	1.95
Nitrates	8,200	58,400	0.14
Zinc	1,650	10,950	0.15
TOTAL			17.30

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 1 - Dudley Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Arsenic	24.3	1.0	24,30
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	12	60.8	0.20
TOTAL			24,50
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Copper	5.9	2,905.1	0.002
Lead	21.4	500	0.04
Manganese	127	391.1	0.32
Zinc	29.3	23,464.3	0.001
TOTAL			0.37

Notes:

PRG values based on residential soil ingestion.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Sediment Site 1 - Dudley Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	NOAA ER-L Value (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to ER-L
Antimony	11.2	2	5.60
Chromium	89.6	80	1.12
Nickel	162	30	5.40
Zinc	122	120	1.02
TOTAL		<u></u>	13.14

Notes:

NOAA ER-L is the effects range low level. Concentrations exceeding this level indicate the potential for an adverse ecological effect to occur.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Surface Water Site 1 - Dudley Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	AWQC Value (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to AWQC
Соррег	31	12	2.58
Lead	278	3.2	86.88
Mercury	0.11	0.012	9.17
Nickel	20.3	160	0.13
TOTAL			98.76

Notes:

AWQC value based on freshwater chronic criteria. Values exceeding these criteria indicate the potential for adverse ecological effects to occur.

APPENDIX A-1b SITE 2 - TURKEY ROAD LANDFILL NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 2 - Turkey Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Lij

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Arsenic	110	0.048666	2,260.30
Beryllium	3.5	0.019806	176.71
TOTAL			2,437.01
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	35,800	36,500	0.98
Barium	197	2,555	0.08
Cadmium	4.5	18.3	0.25
Lead	20.9	4	5.23
Manganese	1,360	182.5	7.45
Nickel	34.8	730	0.05
Nitrates	470	58,400	0.008
Zinc	136	10,950	0.01
TOTAL			14.06

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Sediment Site 2 - Turkey Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	NOAA ER-L Value (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to ER-L
Arsenic	11.7	33	0.36
Cadmium	2.4	5	0.48
Chromium	44.5	80	0.56
Copper	10.7	70	0.15
DDE	0.003	0.002	1.50
Lead	19	35	0.54
Mercury	0.11	0.15	0.73
Nickel	21.2	30	0.71
Silver	28.4	1	28.40
Zinc	116	120	0.97
TOTAL			34.40

Notes:

NOAA ER-L is the effects range low level. Concentrations exceeding this level indicate the potential for an adverse ecological effect to occur.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Surface Water Site 2 - Turkey Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter ·	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	AWQC Value (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to AWQC
Arsenic	5.2	190	0.03
Cadmium	4.1	1.1	3.73
Copper	7.7	12	0.64
Lead	7.9	3.2	2.47
Nickel	24.7	160	0.15
TOTAL			7.02

Notes:

AWQC value based on freshwater chronic criteria. Values exceeding these criteria indicate the potential for adverse ecological effects to occur.

Zinc was detected in the surface water at this site at a concentration of 22.5 ug/l; however, the value is not included in the ranking process due to an error in the Navy database system. This error will be corrected as soon as possible.

APPENDIX A-1c SITE 3 - GROUP 16 MAGAZINE LANDFILL NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 3 - Group 16 Magazine Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Beryllium	23.3	0.019806	1,176.41
Chloroform	29	0.3	96.67
Trichloroethene	86	2.5	34.40
TOTAL			1,307.48
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	202,000	36,500	5.53
Antimony	44	14.6	3.01
Barium	1,220	2,555	0.48
Cadmium	29.7	18.3	1.62
Dichloroethene,1,2-	61	69.2	0.88
Lead	146	4	36.50
Manganese	4,810	182.5	26.36
Mercury	0.54	10.9	0.05
Nickel .	594	730	0.81
Zinc	2,840	10,950	0.26
TOTAL			75.50

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG value for mercury is based on inorganic compounds.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 3 - Group 16 Magazine Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Arsenic	6	1.0	6.00
Chromium	18.4	938.9	0.02
TOTAL			6.02
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Copper	7.3	2,905.1	0.003
Lead	24.4	500	0.05
Manganese	171	391.1	0,44
Nickel	8.6	1,564.3	0.005
Zinc	67.4	23,464.3	0.003
TOTAL.			0.50

Notes:

PRG values based on residential soil ingestion.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Surface Water Site 3 - Group 16 Magazine Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	AWQC Value (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to AWQC
Copper	12	12	1.00
TOTAL	·		1.00

Notes:

AWQC value based on freshwater chronic criteria. Values exceeding these criteria indicate the potential for adverse ecological effects to occur.

APPENDIX A-1d SITE 4 - BURNING PAD RESIDUE LANDFILL NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 4 - Burning Pad Residue Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Arsenic	20.6	0.048666	423.29
Beryllium	20.2	0.019806	1,019.89
Dichloroethene, 1,1-	1	0.1	10.00
RDX	3.3	0.8	4.13
Trichloroethene	17	2.5	6.80
TOTAL			1,464.11
·			
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	70,800	36,500	1.94
Antimony	45.7	14.6	3.13
Barium	287	2,555	0.11
Cadmium	5.2	18.3	0.28
Dichloroethene,1,2-	20	69.2	0.29
HMX .	1.1	1,825	0.001
Lead	49.2	4	12.30
Manganese	3,140	182.5	17.21
Mercury	0.19	10.9	0.02
Nickel	209	730	0.29
Trichloroethane,1,1,1-	2	1,506	0.001
Zinc	735	10,950	0.07
TOTAL			35.64

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG value for mercury is based on inorganic compounds.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 4 - Burning Pad Residue Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Aroclor 1254	0.044	0.1	0.44
Arsenic	6.9	1	6.90
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.9	0.1	9.00
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	1.4	1.2	1.17
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	0.95	1.2	0.79
Beryllium	0.35	0.4	0.88
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	5.3	60.8	0.09
Chromium	10.6	938.9	0.01
Methylene Chloride	0.086	22.3	0.004
RDX	47	7.7	6.10
Trinitrotoluene,2,4,6-	92.6	1703.3	0.05
TOTAL			25.44
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	52,700	78,214.3	0.67
Antimony	62.5	31.3	2.00
Barium	91.8	5,475	0.02
Cadmium	4.7	39,1	0.12
Dinitrotoluene,2,4-	0.43	78.2	0.005
Fluoranthene	2	1,564.3	0.001
НМХ	58	1,955.4	0.03
Lead.	135	500	0.27
Manganese	312	391.1	0.80
Mercury	1.4	23.5	0.06
Nickel	7.9	1,564.3	0.005
Trichloroethane,1,1,1-	0.023	300	0.00007
Zinc	540	23,464.3	0.02
TOTAL			4.00

Notes:

PRG values based on residential soil ingestion.
PRG value for mercury is based on inorganic compounds.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Sediment Site 4 - Burning Pad Residue Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	NOAA ER-L Value (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to ER-L
Antimony	43.1	2	21.55
Arsenic	9.7	33	0.29
Cadmium	2.99	5	0.60
Chlordane, alpha	0.04	0.0005	80.00
Chlordane, gamma	0.033	0.0005	66.00
Chromium	30.6	80	0.38
Copper	33.6	70	0.48
DDD .	0.91	0.002	455.00
DDE	0.056	0.002	28.00
DDT	0.015	0.001	15.00
Lead	32.5	35	0.93
Mercury	0.34	0.15	2.27
Nickel	33.6	30	1.12
Zinc	1,200	120	10.00
TOTAL			681.62

Notes:

NOAA ER-L is the effects range low level. Concentrations exceeding this level indicate the potential for an adverse ecological effect to occur.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Surface Water Site 4 - Burning Pad Residue Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	AWQC Value (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to AWQC
Antimony	44.1	30	1.47
Arsenic	43.4	190	0.23
Beryllium	2.2	5.3	0.42
Cadmium	11.6	1.1	10.55
Chromium	46	210	0.22
Dinitrotoluene,2,4-	0.44	230	0.002
Lead	215	3.2	67.19
Mercury	5.56	0.012	463.33
Nickel	29	160	0.18
TOTAL			543.59

Notes:

AWQC value based on freshwater chronic criteria. Values exceeding these criteria indicate the potential for adverse ecological effects to occur.

Nitramine compounds were detected at high concentrations (i.e., HMX at 19 ug/l; RDX at 170 ug/l; 1,3,5-TNB at 2.6 ug/l; 1,3-DNB at 0.34 ug/l; nitrobenzene at 0.38 ug/l; 2,4,6-TNT at 8.3 ug/l; and 2,4-DNT at 0.44 ug/l). There is no surface water quality criteria for these compounds; thus, although these levels may indicate a potential problem, none will be evident via this manner of site ranking.

Zinc was detected in the surface water at this site at a concentration of 3,880 ug/l; however, this value is not included in the ranking process due to an error in the Navy database system. This error will be corrected as soon as possible.

APPENDIX A-1e SITE 5 - SURPLUS TRANSFORMER STORAGE AREA NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 5 - Surplus Transformer Storage Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Aroclor 1260	1.4	0.1	14.00
TOTAL			14.00

Notes:

PRG values based on residential soil ingestion.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic values.

APPENDIX A-1f SITE 6 - EXPLOSIVES-CONTAMINATED WASTEWATER IMPOUNDMENT NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 6 - Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Impoundment Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Dichloroethene,1,1-	16	0.1	160.00
RDX	17	0.8	21.25
Trichloroethene	380	2.5	152.00
TOTAL			333.25
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Antimony	57.2	14.6	3.92
Cadmium	4.5	18.3	0.25
Dichloroethene,1,2-	86	69.2	1.24
нмх	7.6	1,825	0.004
Manganese	319	182.5	1.75
TOTAL			7.16

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 6 - Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Impoundment Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Arsenic	6.4	1.0	6.40
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	0.45	60.8	0.007
Chromium	25.1	938.9	0.03
RDX	2.9	7.7	0.38
TOTAL			6.82
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Copper	5.5	2,905.1	0.002
HMX	5.6	1,955.4	0.003
Lead	50.3	500	0.10
Zinc	214	23,464.3	0.009
TOTAL			0.11

Notes:

PRG values based on residential soil ingestion.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Sediment Site 6 - Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Impoundment Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	NOAA ER-L Value (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to ER-L
Antimony	48.2	2	24.10
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.31	0.4	0.78
Cadmium	9.8	5	1.96
Chromium	94.8	80	1.19
Copper	130	70	1.86
Fluoranthene	0.84	0.6	1.40
Lead	68.1	35	1.95
Nickel	100	30	3.33
Pyrene	0.93	0.35	2.66
Zinc	643	120	5.36
TOTAL			44.59

Notes:

NOAA ER-L is the effects range low level. Concentrations exceeding this level indicate the potential for an adverse ecological effect to occur.

Volatile and nitramine compounds were detected at very high concentrations (i.e., TCE at 180 mg/kg; 1,1,1-TCA at 190 mg/kg; HMX at 710 mg/kg; RDX at 160 mg/kg). There are no sediment quality criteria for these compounds; thus, although these levels may indicate a potential problem, none will be evident via this manner of site ranking.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Surface Water Site 6 - Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Impoundment Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

 $L_{\pm j}$

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	AWQC Value (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to AWQC
Chromium	61.2	210	0.29
Copper	50.3	12	4.19
Lead	78.8	3.2	24.63
Mercury	0.21	0.012	17.50
Nickel	84.2	160	0.53
TOTAL			47.14

Notes:

AWQC value based on freshwater chronic criteria. Values exceeding these criteria indicate the potential for adverse ecological effects to occur.

Nitramine compounds were detected at high concentrations (i.e., HMX at 12 ug/l; RDX at 33 ug/l; 2,4,6-TNT at 36 ug/l). There are no surface water quality criteria for these compounds; thus, although these levels may indicate a potential problem, none will be evident via this manner of site ranking.

APPENDIX A-1g SITE 7 - PLANT 3 EXPLOSIVES-CONTAMINATED WASTEWATER DISCHARGE AREA NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

14

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 7 - Plant 3 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Beryllium	18	0.01981	908.63
Dichloroethene,1,1-	160	0.1	1,600.00
Dinitrotoluene,2,6-	19	0.1	190.00
RDX	2,300	0.8	2,875.00
TOTAL			5,573.63
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	126,000	36,500	3.45
Cadmium	12.6	18.3	0.69
Dichloroethane,1,1-	58	1,006.9	0.06
нмх	190	1,825	0.10
Lead	61	4	15.25
Manganese	6,790	182.5	37.21
Mercury	0.23	10.9	0.02
Nickel	328	730	0.45
Nitrobenzene	0.59	18.3	0.03
Trichloroethane, 1, 1, 1-	9,900	1,506	6.57
Trinitrobenzene,1,3,5-	8.5	1.8	4.72
Zinc	985	10,950	0.09
TOTAL			68.64

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG value for mercury is based on inorganic compounds.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 7 - Plant 3 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Arsenic	2.1	1.0	2.10
Beryllium	0.8	0.4	2.00
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	0.53	60.8	0.009
TOTAL			4.11
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Chromium	13.6	391.1	0.03
Manganese	181	391.1	0.46
Nickel	9.1	1,564.3	0.006
Zinc	31.9	23,464.3	0.001
TOTAL			0.50

Notes:

PRG values based on residential soil ingestion.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Sediment Site 7 - Plant 3 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	NOAA ER-L Value (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to ER-L
Antimony	30.4	2	15.20
Cadmium Copper	5.8 79.4	1.16	1.16
Lead	95.3	35	2.72
Zinc	403	120	3.36
TOTAL			23.57

Notes:

NOAA ER-L is the effects range low level. Concentrations exceeding this level indicate the potential for an adverse ecological effect to occur.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Surface Water Site 7 - Plant 3 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	AWQC Value (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to AWQC
Chromium	77.8	210	0.37
Соррег	137	12	11.42
Lead	114	3.2	35.63
Mercury	0.24	0.012	20.00
Nickel	47.1	160	0.29
TOTAL			67.71

Notes:

AWQC value based on freshwater chronic criteria. Values exceeding these criteria indicate the potential for adverse ecological effects to occur.

Zinc was detected in the surface water at this site at a concentration of 590 ug/l; however, this value was not included in the ranking process due to an error in the Navy database system. This error will be corrected as soon as possible.

APPENDIX A-1h SITE 8 - NEDED EXPLOSIVES-CONTAMINATED WASTEWATER DISCHARGE AREA NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 8 - NEDED Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC .			
Beryllium	4.5	0.0198	227.27
RDX	64	0.8	80.00
Trichloroethene	15	2.5	6.00
TOTAL			313.27
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	27,700	36,500	0.76
НМХ	13	1,825	0.007
Lead	20.2	4	5.05
Manganese	547	182.5	3.00
Zinc	216	10,950	0.02
TOTAL			8.84

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 8 - NEDED Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Aroclor 1254	0.019	0.1	0.19
Arsenic	2.6	1	2.60
DDD	0.0022	3.5	0.001
DDE	0.0031	2.5	0.001
Dieldrin	0.0031	0.1	0.03
RDX	3.4	7.7	0.44
Trichloroethene	0.032	14.4	0.002
Vinyl Chloride	0.009	0.0097	0.93
TOTAL			4.19
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Соррег	20.6	2,905.1	0.007
Dichloroethene,1,2-	0.09	281.8	0.0003
HMX	2.8	1,955.4	0.0007
Lead	62.7	500	0.13
Nickel	12.4	1,564.3	0.008
Vanadium	29.8	547.5	0.05
Zinc	165	23,464.3	0.007
TOTAL			0.20

Notes:

PRG values based on residential soil ingestion.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Sediment Site 8 - NEDED Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	NOAA ER-L Valuc (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to ER-L
Lead	38.7	35	1.11
Mercury	2	0.15	13.33
Zinc	125	120	1.04
TOTAL			15.48

Notes:

NOAA ER-L is the effects range low level. Concentrations exceeding this level indicate the potential for an adverse ecological effect to occur.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Surface Water Site 8 - NEDED Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/I)	AWQC Value (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to AWQC
Copper	6.1	12	0.51
Lead	31.5	3.2	9.84
Nickel	21.3	160	0.13
TOTAL			10.48

Notes:

AWQC value based on freshwater chronic criteria. Values exceeding these criteria indicate the potential for adverse ecological effects to occur.

APPENDIX A-1i SITE 9 -PLANT 1 EXPLOSIVES-CONTAMINATED WASTEWATER DISCHARGE AREA NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 9 - Plant 1 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Beryllium	25.3	0.0198	1,277.39
Trinitrotoluene,2,4,6-	2,300	170.3	13.51
TOTAL			1,290.90
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	85,300	36,500	2.34
Barium	2,070	2,555	0.81
Cadmium	5.8	18.3	0.32
Dinitrotoluene,2,4-	12	73	0.16
Lead	248	4	62.00
Manganese	9,130	182.5	50.03
Mercury	1.82	10.9	0.17
Nickel	164	730	0.23
Trinitrobenzene,1,3,5-	6.3	1.8	3.50
Zinc	3,940	10,950	0.36
TOTAL			119.92

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG value for mercury is based on inorganic compounds.

PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 9 - Plant 1 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Arsenic	19.7	1	19.70
Benzo(a)anthracene	0.55	1.2	0.46
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.62	1.2	0.52
Beryllium	0.86	0.4	2,15
Chromium	19.3	938.9	0.02
Chrysene	0.59	116.7	0.005
Trinitrotoluene,2,4,6-	2,100	1,703.3	1.23
TOTAL			24.09
	·		
NONCARCINOGENIC		***************************************	
Copper	23.5	2,905.1	0.008
Dinitrotoluene,2,4-	3.2	78.2	0.04
Fluoranthene	1.1	1,564.3	0.001
Lead	64.7	500	0.13
Mercury	1.01	23.5	0.04
Nickel	8.6	1,564.3	0.005
Trinitrobenzene,1,3,5-	3	2	1.50
Vanadium	60.6	547.5	0.11
Zinc	175	23,464.3	0.007
TOTAL			1.84

Notes:

PRG values based on residential soil ingestion.
PRG value for mercury is based on inorganic compounds.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Sediment Site 9 - Plant 1 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	NOAA ER-L Value (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to ER-L
Acenaphthene	1.6	0.15	10.67
Anthracene	2.3	0.085	27.06
Arsenic	35.1	33	1.06
Benzo(a)anthracene	7.5	0.23	32.61
Benzo(a)pyrene	6	0.4	15.00
Copper	94.2	70	1.35
Chrysene	8.6	0.4	21.50
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	1.5	0.06	25.00
Fluoranthene	10	0.6	16.67
Fluorene	1.9	0.035	54.29
Lead	266	35	7.60
Mercury	0.55	0.15	3.67
Phenanthrene	9.1	0.225	40.44
Pyrene	12	0.35	34.29
Zinc	442	120	3.68
TOTAL			294.89

Notes:

NOAA ER-L is the effects range low level. Concentrations exceeding this level indicate the potential for an adverse ecological effect to occur.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Surface Water Site 9 - Plant 1 Explosives-Contaminated Wastewater Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	AWQC Value (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to AWQC
Dinitrotoluene,2,4-	0.38	230	0.002
Dinitrotoluene,2,6-	0.29	230	0.001
Lead	19.8	3.2	6.19
TOTAL			6.19

Notes:

AWQC value based on freshwater chronic criteria. Values exceeding these criteria indicate the potential for adverse ecological effects to occur.

APPENDIX A-1j SITE 11 - ABANDONED EXPLOSIVES BURNING PITS NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 11 - Abandoned Explosives Burning Pits Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Arsenic	90.3	0.048666	1,855.50
RDX .	28	0.8	35.00
TOTAL			1,890.50
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	14,500	36,500	0.40
Cadmium	10.3	18.3	0.56
нмх	4.2	1,825	0.002
Lead	20.7	4	5.18
Manganese	206	182.5	1.13
Zinc	134	10,950	0.01
TOTAL			7.28

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 11 - Abandoned Explosives Burning Pits Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Barium	98.2	5,475	0.02
Copper	26.5	2,905.1	0.009
TOTAL			0.03

Notes:

PRG values based on residential soil ingestion.
PRG values calculated for highest of noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Sediment Site 11 - Abandoned Explosives Burning Pits Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	NOAA ER-L Value (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to ER-L
Mercury	0.18	0.15	1.20
TOTAL			1.20

Notes:

NOAA ER-L is the effects range low level. Concentrations exceeding this level indicate the potential for an adverse ecological effect to occur.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Surface Water Site 11 - Abandoned Explosives Burning Pits Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	AWQC Value (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to AWQC
Arsenic	143	190	0.75
Chromium	71.6	210	0.34
Copper	258	12	21.50
Lead	300	3.2	93.75
Mercury	1.46	0.012	121.67
Nickel	61.9	160	0.39
TOTAL			238.40

Notes:

AWQC value based on freshwater chronic criteria. Values exceeding these criteria indicate the potential for adverse ecological effects to occur.

Zinc was detected in the surface water at this site at a concentration of 904 ug/l; however, this value was not included in the ranking process due to an error in the Navy database system. This error will be corrected as soon as possible.

APPENDIX A-1k SITE 12 - BARRACKS ROAD LANDFILL NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 12 - Barracks Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Chloroform	2	0.3	6.67
RDX	4.4	0.8	5,50
Trichloroethene	55	2.5	22.00
Trinitrotoluene,2,4,6-	1.5	170.3	0.009
TOTAL			34.18
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Acetone	14	768.4	0.02
Aluminum	17,200	36,500	0.47
Antimony	46.3 ·	14.6	3.17
Cadmium	7.4	18.3	0.40
Dichloroethene,1,2-	4	69.2	0.06
Lead	27.3	4	6.83
Manganese	3,300	182.5	18.08
Trinitrobenzene,1,3,5-	0.91	1.8	0.51
Zinc	160	10,950	0.02
TOTAL			29.56

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 12 - Barracks Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Arsenic	28.2	1	28.20
Benzo(a)anthracene	1.4	1.2	1.17
Benzo(a)pyrene	1.2	0.1	12.00
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	1.9	1.2	1.58
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	1.5	1.2	1.25
Beryllium	1.8	0.4	4.50
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	4.4	60.8	0.07
Chlordane, alpha-	0.084	0.7	0.12
Chlordane, gamma-	0.084	0.7	0.12
Chromium	44.9	928.9	0.05
Chrysene	1.5	116.7	0.01
DDD	0.35	3.5	0.10
DDE	3.6	2.5	1.44
DDT	5.7	2.5	2.28
Trinitrotoluene,2,4,6-	15	1,703.3	0.009
TOTAL			52.90
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	17,400	78,214.3	0.22
Barium	1,180	5,475	0.22
Cadmium	30.6	39.1	0.78
Copper	720	2,905.1	0.25
Fluoranthene	4.1	1,564.3	0.003
Lead	1,200	500	2.40
Manganese	760	391.1	1.94
Mercury	2.87	23.5	0.12
Nickel	49.6	1564.3	0.03
Vanadium	93.1	547.5	0.17
Zinc	2,950	23,464.3	0.13
TOTAL			6.26

Quantitative Site Ranking - Sediment Site 12 Barracks Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	NOAA ER-L Value (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to ER-L
Benzo(a)anthracene	0.14	0.23	0.61
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.11	0.4	0.28
Cadmium	8.2	5	1.64
Chlordane, alpha	0.116	0.0005	232.00
Chlordane, gamma	0.116	0.0005	232.00
Chrysene	0.12	0.4	0.30
DDD	0.18	0.002	90.00
DDE	0.052	0.002	26.00
DDT	0.22	0.001	220.00
Fluoranthene	0.3	0.6	0.50
Lead	59.4	35	1.70
Mercury	0.24	0.15	1.60
Phenanthrene	0.12	. 0.225	0.53
Pyrene	0.18	0.35	0.51
Silver	3	1	3.00
Zinc	286	120	2.38
TOTAL			813.05

Notes:

NOAA ER-L is the effects range low level. Concentrations exceeding this level indicate the potential for an adverse ecological effect to occur.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Surface Water Site 12 - Barracks Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	AWQC Value (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to AWQC
Cadmium	15.5	1.1	14.09
Copper	15.1	12	1.26
DDT	0.46	0.001	460.00
Lead	42	3.2	13.13
Mercury	0.24	0.012	20.00
Nickel	19	160	0.12
Trichloroethene	4	21,900	0.0002
TOTAL			508.60

Notes:

AWQC value based on freshwater chronic criteria. Values exceeding these criteria indicate the potential for adverse ecological effects to occur.

Zinc was detected in the surface water at this site at a concentration of 100 ug/l; however, this value is not included in the ranking process due to an error in the Navy database system. This error will be corrected as soon as possible.

APPENDIX A-11 SITE 16 - WEST ROAD LANDFILL NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 16 - West Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Arsenic	17.8	0.04866	365.76
Beryllium	7.8	0.0198	393.94
Dichlorobenzene,1,4-	4	0.7	5.71
Dichloroethene, 1,1-	1	0.1	10.00
RDX	1.3	0.8	1.63
TOTAL			777.04
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	102,000	36,500	2.80
Antimony	48.3	14.6	3.31
Barium	362	2,555	0.14
Cadmium	5.7	18.3	0.31
Chlorobenzene	6	51.7	0.12
Dichloroethane, 1, 1-	3	1,006.9	0.003
Lead	56	4	14.00
Manganese	857	182.5	4.70
Mercury	0.25	10.9	0.02
Nickel	167	730	0.23
Phenol	1	21,900	0.00005
Trichloroethane,1,1,1-	3	1,506	0.002
Zinc	376	10,950	0.03
TOTAL			25.67

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG value for mercury is based on inorganic compounds.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 16 - West Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Aroclor 1248	0.024	0.1	0.24
Aroclor 1254	0.88	0.1	8.80
Aroclor 1260	0.12	0.1	1.20
Arsenic	1.7	1	1.70
Beryllium	0.47	0.4	1.18
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	0.59	60.8	0.01
Chromium	26.3	938.9	0.03
DDD	0.0023	3.5	0.001
DDE	0.0065	2.5	0.003
DDT	0.0019	2.5	0.001
Dieldrin	0.0077	0.1	0.08
TOTA	L		13.25
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	4,630	78,214.3	0.06
Barium	36.8	5,475	0.007
Cadmium	13.6	39.1	0.35
Lead	258	500	0.52
Manganese	470	391.1	1.20
Mercury	1.08	23.5	0.05
Nickel	18.3	1,564.3	0.01
Zinc	559	23,464.3	0.02
TOTA	L		2.22

Notes:

PRG values based on residential soil ingestion.
PRG value for mercury is based on inorganic compounds.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Sediment Site 16 - West Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	NOAA ER-L Value (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to ER-L
Anthracene	0.021	0.085	0.25
Arsenic	6.5	33	0.20
Benzo(a)anthracene	0.074	0.23	0.32
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.05	0.4	0.13
Cadmium	1.8	5	0.36
Chromium	17.2	80	0.22
Chrysene	0.075	0.4	0.19
Соррег	8.3	70	0.12
Fluoranthene	0.19	0.6	0.32
Lead	17.9	35	0.51
Nickel	28.6	30	0.95
Phenanthrene	0.077	0.225	0.34
Pyrene	0.081	0.35	0.23
Zinc	149	120	1.24
TOTAL			5.38

Notes:

NOAA ER-L is the effects range low level. Concentrations exceeding this level indicate the potential for an adverse ecological effect to occur.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Surface Water Site 16 - West Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	AWQC Value (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to AWQC
Antimony	62.8	30	2.09
Arsenic	47.4	190	0.25
Beryllium	26.3	5.3	4.96
Cadmium	46.6	1.1	42.36
Chromium	517	210	2.46
Lead	293	3.2	91.56
Mercury	2.91	0.012	242.50
Nickel	775	160	4.84
Phenol	27	2,560	0.01
TOTAL			391.03

Notes:

AWQC value based on freshwater chronic criteria. Values exceeding these criteria indicate the potential for adverse ecological effects to occur.

Volatile compounds were detected at high concentrations (i.e., 1,1-DCE at 2 ug/l; 1,1-DCA at 5 ug/l; 1,1,1-TCA at 8 ug/l; and 4-methylphenol at 850 ug/l). There are no surface water quality criteria for these compounds; thus, although these levels may indicate a potential problem, none will be evident via this manner of site ranking.

Zinc was detected in the surface water at this site at a concentration of 4,890 ug/l; however, this value is not included in the ranking process due to an error in the Navy database system. This error will be corrected as soon as possible.

APPENDIX A-1m SITE 17 - HOLM ROAD LANDFILL NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 17 - Holm Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Arsenic	2.8	1.0	2.80
Benzo(a)anthracene	2.5	1.2	2.08
Benzo(a)pyrene	5	0.1	50.00
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	3	1.2	2.50
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	2.8	1.2	2.33
Chrysene	2.6	116.7	0.02
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	0.97	0.1	9.70
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	2.7	1.2	2.25
TOTAL			71.68
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Anthracene	3.6	1.9	1.89
Fluoranthene	1.8	1,564.3	0.001
Manganese	128	391.1	0.33
Mercury	0.08	23.5	0.003
Pyrene	3.9	1,173.2	0.003
Zinc	26.9	23,464.3	0.001
TOTAL			2.23

Notes:

PRG values based on residential soil ingestion.
PRG value for mercury is based on inorganic compounds.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 17 - Holm Road Landfill Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC		·	
Arsenic	106	0.048666	2,178.11
Beryllium	5.8	0.019806	292.84
TOTAL			2,470.95
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	164,000	36,500	4.49
Lead	65.4	4	16.35
Manganese	405	182.5	2.22
Mercury	0.36	10.9	0.03
Nickel	351	730	0.48
Zinc	231	10,950	0.02
TOTAL			23.55

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG value for mercury is based on inorganic compounds.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

APPENDIX A-1n SITE 18 - BUILDING 476 DISCHARGE AREA NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 18 - Building 476 Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Beryllium	7.5	0.019806	378.67
TOTAL			378.67
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	144,000	36,500	3.95
Barium	505	2,555	0.20
Cadmium	12.6	18.3	0.69
Lead	260	4	65.00
Manganese	849	182.5	4.65
Мегсигу	0.73	10.9	0.07
Nickel	23.2	730	0.03
Zinc	357	10,950	0.03
TOTAL			74.62

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG value for mercury is based on inorganic compounds.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Sediment Site 18 - Building 476 Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	NOAA ER-L Value (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to ER-L
Antimony	12.8	2.00	6.40
Arsenic	1.9	33	0.06
Chromium	18	80	0.23
Copper	29	70	0.41
Lead	8.3	35	0.24
Nickel	5.3	30	0.18
Zinc	44	120	0.37
TOTAL			7.89

Notes:

NOAA ER-L is the effects range low level. Concentrations exceeding this level indicate the potential for an adverse ecological effect to occur.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Surface Water Site 18 - Building 476 Discharge Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	AWQC Value (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to AWQC	
Arsenic	4.1	190	0.02	
Copper	199	12	16.58	
TOTAL			16.60	

Notes:

AWQC value based on freshwater chronic criteria. Values exceeding these criteria indicate the potential for adverse ecological effects to occur.

Zinc was detected in the surface water at this site at a concentration of 369 ug/L; however, this value is not included in the ranking process due to an error in the Navy database system. This error will be corrected as soon as possible.

APPENDIX A-10 SITE 19 - CONVEYOR BELT SOILS AT BUILDING 10 NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 19 - Conveyor Belt Soils at Building 10 Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Trinitrotoluene,2,4,6-	5.1	170.3	0.03
TOTAL			0.03
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	4,510	36,500	0.12
Cadmium	4.5	18.3	0.25
Manganese	3,480	182.5	19.07
Trinitrobenzene,1,3,5-	1.3	1.8	0.72
TOTAL			20.16

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 19 - Conveyor Belt Soils at Building 10 Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Arsenic	28.3	1	28.30
Beryllium	2.6	0.4	6.50
Chromium	28.7	938.9	0.03
Dinitrotoluene,2,6-	0.77	1.3	0.59
Trinitrotoluene,2,4,6-	120	1703.3	0.07
TOTAL			35.49
·			
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Copper	14.9	2,905.1	0.005
Dinitrotoluene,2,4-	1.3	78.2	0.02
Lead	49.9	500	0.10
Manganese	220	391.1	0.56
Nickei	20	1,564.3	0.01
Trinitrobenzene,1,3,5-	4.9	2	2.45
Vanadium	49.1	547.5	0.09
Zinc	69.1	23,464.3	0.003
TOTAL			3.24

Notes:

PRG values based on residential soil ingestion.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Sediment Site 19 - Conveyor Belt Soils at Building 10 Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured NOAA ER-L Concentration Value (mg/kg) (mg/kg)		Ratio of Measured Conc. to ER-L
Anthracene	0.4	0.085	4.70
Benzo(a)anthracene	1.6	0.23	6.96
Benzo(a)pyrene	1.2	0.4	3.00
Chrysene	8.2	0.4	20.50
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	0.46	0.06	7.67
Fluoranthene	27	0.6	45.00
Fluorene	0.23	0.035	6.57
Phenanthrene	26	0.225	115.56
Pyrene	13	0.35	37.14
Zinc	125	120	1.04
TOTAL			248.14

Notes:

NOAA ER-L is the effects range low level. Concentrations exceeding this level indicate the potential for an adverse ecological effect to occur.

APPENDIX A-1p SITE 21 - BATTERY AND DRUM DISPOSAL AREA NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Quantitative Site Ranking - Groundwater Site 21 - Battery and Drum Disposal Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (ug/l)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (ug/l)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG	
CARCINOGENIC				
Arsenic	5.8	0.048666	119.18	
Beryllium	18.1	0.019806	913.86	
TOTAL			1,032.36	
NONCARCINOGENIC				
Aluminum	80,300	36,500	2.20	
Barium	412	2,555	0.16	
Cadmium	145	18.3	7.92	
Lead	83	4	20.75	
Manganese	7,870	182.5	43.12	
Mercury	0.25	10.9	0.02	
Nickel	117	730	0.16	
Nitrates	25,100	58,400	0.43	
Zinc	999,999	10,950	91.32	
TOTAL		·	166.08	

Notes:

PRG values based on ingestion of tap water.

PRG value for mercury is based on inorganic compounds.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

The actual zinc concentration in the groundwater was 2,490,000 ug/l; however, the Navy database fields are not large enough to accommodate a number above 999,999.00.

Quantitative Site Ranking - Soil Site 21 - Battery and Drum Disposal Area Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

Parameter	Measured Concentration (mg/kg)	Region IX PRG (2/94) (mg/kg)	Ratio of Measured Conc. to PRG
CARCINOGENIC			
Arsenic	28.3	1	28.30
Beryllium	0.57	0.4	1.43
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.99	1.2	0.83
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	0.54	1.2	0.45
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	2.1	60.8	0.04
Chromium	28.4	938.9	0.03
Chrysene	0.52	116.7	0.004
Pentachlorophenol	0.29	7.1	0.04
TOTAL			31.12
NONCARCINOGENIC			
Aluminum	13,700	78,214.3	0.18
Barium	72.8	5,475	0.01
Cadmium	8.6	39.1	0.22
Lead	113	500	0.23
Manganese	1,380	391.1	3.52
Mercury	0.76	23.5	0.03
Nickel	9.2	1,564	0.006
Pyrene	0.98	1,173	0.001
Styrene	0.02	13,000	0.000002
Trichloroethane, 1, 1, 1-	0.014	300	0.00004
Toluene	0.035	280	0.0001
Xylene	0.004	99	0.00004
			0.00
Zinc	2,160	23,464.3	0.09

Notes:

PRG values based on residential soil ingestion.

PRG value for mercury is based on inorganic compounds.
PRG values calculated for highest of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic values.

APPENDIX A-2 RELATIVE RISK RANKING FY 1996 - PRESENT

RELATIVE RISK EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year):	3/4/96		
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment,	Soil): GW SW	/H SEDEM SOIL	
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00001	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/R	IA, or equiv. RC	RA Stage):	
RMIS Site Type: LANDFILL	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreem	ent e.g., FFA, Pe	rmit, Order) Yes	
Point of Contact (Name/Phone): Jeffrey Harlow	National Priority List (Y/N):	Ю	Site Rank:	High
	SITE SUMMARY			
(Include only key elements of information used	d to conduct the relative risk site evaluation.	Attach map view	of site if desired.)	
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	, and other relevant information):			
				,
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):				
Distribution of Laminage (Ground Matery Statistics Matery Statistics)				
				· •
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):				
		•		

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Ground Wate	<u>*************************************</u>		
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD FACTOR (1) 'CHF')	T	Contaminant Trichloroethylene (TCE) Dichloroethylene, 1,2- (mixture) Trichloroethane, 1,1,2- Cadmium and compounds Aluminum Zinc Nitrate (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only	Maximum Co ug/L 18,000.0 1,000.0 28.0 5.9 10,500.0 1,650.0 8,200.0	onc.	Standard ug/L 160.0 55.0 20.0 18.0 37,000.0 11,000.0 58,000.0	Ratio (2) 112,500 18.180 1.400 0.320 0.290 0.150 0.140	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION Evident - PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF) Potential -		(2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that contamination in the media is moving away from the source. Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined		Confined -	Information indicates that the po- contaminant migration from the geological structures or physical	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:	
RECEPTOR FACTOR RF)	Identified -	There is a threatened or potentially threatened w downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. or drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I or There is no potentially threatened water supply of the source. The groundwater is potentially us irrigation or agriculture, but not presently used (e for Selection:	not) is a current IIA aquifer). well downgradient table for DW,	Limited •	the source. The groundwater is	d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of e (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X Limited:
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name:	SITE 00001		Groundwater Category:	High

Soil Maximum Conc. Standard CONTAMINANT Ratio (2) mg/Kg HAZARD mg/Kg Contaminant 001.1 22.0 24.3 FACTOR (1) Arsenic (cancer endpoint) (Place an "X" next to one below) 21,4 400.0 0.050 (CHF) Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) 3,200.0 0.000 12.0 0.000 Significant (If Total > 100): Copper and compounds 5.9 2,800.0 23,000.0 0.000 29.3 Zinc Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2): Total: 1.165 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. (Place an "X" next to one below) Confined - Low possibility for contamination to be present at MIGRATION Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that Evident or migrate to a point of exposure contamination is present at, is moving towards, or has PATHWAY Evident: FACTOR moved to a point of exposure (MPF) Potential: Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient Confined: to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) Receptors identified that have access to Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to RECEPTOR Identified contaminated soil Identified: FACTOR contaminated soil (RF) Potential: Potential for receptors to have access to Potential -Limited: contaminated soil Brief Rationale for Selection: Soil Category: Low Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS Site Name: SITE 00001 (High, Medium, Low)

, e/63300

			Surface Wa	ter Human		
ONTAMINANT AZARD ACTOR (1) EHF)	r	Contaminant Lead Nickel and compounds Copper and compounds Mercury and compounds (inorganic)	Maximum Conc. ug/L 278.0 20.3 31.0 0.11	Standard ug/L 4.0 730.0 1,400.0 11.0	Ratio (2) 69,500 0.030 0.020 0.010	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		Total:	69.301	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential •	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates to contamination in the media is present at, is movin toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or n	ng nigrate	nfined - Information indicates a low pote to a potential point of exposure (of presence of geological structures	could by due to the	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X
		to a point of exposure; or information is not suffic to make a determination of Evident or Confined	cient			Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:				
ECEPTOR ACTOR (F)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surface w	vater Li	mited - Little or no potential for receptor surface water	s to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to surface v	vater			Potential: X Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				

			Surface Water E	co Marine			
ONTAMINANT	r	Contaminant	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)		
ACTOR (1)		Antimony and compounds	11.2	2.0	5.600		
CHF)		Nickel and compounds	162.0	30.0	5.400	(Place an "X" next to one below)	
CHF)		Chromium (total)	89.6	8.0	1,120		
		Zinc	122.0	120.0	1,020	Significant (If Total > 100):	
						Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):	
						Minimal (If Total < 2):	
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard		Total:	13.137		
		Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.					
IGRATION	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate	that Confin	ned - Information indicates a low pote		(Place an "X" next to one below)	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	contamination in the media is present at, is moving toward, or has moved to a point of exposure			potential point of exposure (could be due to the presence of geological structures of or physical controls)			
	Potential •	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suf to make a determination of Evident or Confined	ficient			Potential: Confined:	
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
						and mark to 1.1. A	
n anna a	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to sedime	nt Limit	ted - Little or no potential for receptor	rs to have access to sediment	(Place an "X" next to one below)	
ECEPTOR ACTOR	identified -	Receptors identified that have access to sedime				Identified: X	
UF)						Potential:	
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to sedime	nt				
	r otentiar -	, 0.2				Limited:	
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
Activity Name	YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: SITE 0000	1	Sediment Marine Category: (High, Medium, Low)	High	

RELATIVE RISK EVALUATION WORKSHEET

•						
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year)	: 3/4/96				
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SWH SEDEM					
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00002	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv,	RD/RA, or equiv. Re	CRA Stage):	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
RMIS Site Type: LANDFILL	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a	greement e.g., FFA, I	Permit, Order) Yes			
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	<u>No</u>	Site Rank:	High		
	SITE SUMMARY	•				
(Include only key elements of information used	to conduct the relative risk site evalua	ation. Attach map view	w of site if desired.)			
D. C. Cit. D	and other relevant information's					
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	and other relevant information):					
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):						
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						
Blief Description of Receptors (Italian and Deological).						

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Ground Wate	PT .		40.
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) CHF)		Contaminant Lead Beryllium and compounds Aluminum Chromium (total) Cadmium and compounds Barium and compounds Nickel and compounds Zinc Nitrate Arsenic (cancer endpoint) (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standa	Maximum C ug/L 20.9 3.5 35,800.0 97.4 4.5 197.0 34.8 136.0 470.0 110.0		Standard ug/L 4.0 1.6 37,000.0 180.0 18.0 2,600.0 730.0 11,000.0 58,000.0 0.0	Ratio (2) 5.220 2.190 0.980 0.530 0.250 0.080 0.050 0.010 0.010	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): X Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY PACTOR MPF)	Evident - Potential - Brief Rationale	Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Analytical data or observable evidence indic contamination in the media is moving away. Possibility for contamination to be present at to a point of exposure; or information is not to make a determination of Evident or Confider for Selection:	ates that from the source. t or migrate sufficient	Confined	- Information indicates that the po- contaminant migration from the geological structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X Confined:
ECEPTOR ACTOR RF)	Identified - Potential -	There is a threatened or potentially threatened downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I There is no potentially threatened water support the source. The groundwater is potentially irrigation or agriculture, but not presently use for Selection:	or not) is a current or IIA aquifer). ply well downgradient y usable for DW,	Limited :	the source. The groundwater is	ed water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of se (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited:
activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name:	SITE 00002		Groundwater Category:	<u>Męd</u>

			Surface Water	er Human			
ONTAMINANT	7	,	Maximum Conc.	Standard			
AZARD		Contaminant	ug/I.	ug/L	Ratio (2)		
ACTOR (1)		Lead	7.9	4,0	1.980		
HF)	Cadmium and compounds		4.1	18.0	0.220	(Place an "X" next to one below)	
		Nickel and compounds	24.7	730.0	0.030		
		Copper and compounds	7,7	1,400.0	0.010	Significant (If Total > 100):	
		Zinc	22.5	11,000.0	0.000		
		Arsenic (cancer endpoint)	5.2	0.0		Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):	
						Minimal (If Total < 2):	
				<u> </u>			
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only		Total:	2.241		
		(2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.					
			no about Count	lined - Information indicates a low pote	ential for contemination	(Place an "X" next to one below)	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination in the media is present at, is mo		to a potential point of exposure (to a potential point of exposure (could by due to the		
		toward, or has moved to a point of exposure		presence of geological structures	Evident:		
irr)	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at o	r migrate			Potential: X	
		to a point of exposure; or information is not su to make a determination of Evident or Confine					
	Brief Rational	Brief Rationale for Selection:					
						(Place an "X" next to one below)	
ECEPTOR	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surfac	e water Lin	nited - Little or no potential for receptor	rs to have access to		
FACTOR				surface water	Identified:		
F)						Potential: X	
	Potential - Potential for receptors to have access to surface water						
	1 Otential					Limited:	
	Brief Rational						
			<u></u>				
ctivity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: SITE 000	Surf	ace Water Human Category: (High, Medium, Low)	Med	

Surface Water Eco Marine CONTAMINANT Maximum Conc. Standard HAZARD Contaminant mg/Kg mg/Kg Ratio (2) 28.4 28,400 FACTOR (1) Silver and compounds 1.0 (Place an "X" next to one below) 116.0 120.0 0.970 (CHF) Nickel and compounds 21.2 30.0 0.710 Chromium (total) 44.5 8.0 0.560 Significant (If Total > 100): 19.0 35.0 0.540 0.480 Cadmium and compounds 2.4 5.0 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): 11.7 33.0 0.350 Arsenic (cancer endpoint) Copper and compounds 10.7 7.0 0.150 Minimal (If Total < 2): 0.15 Mercury and compounds (inorganic) 0.11 DDE 0.003 0.002 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only Total: 32,160 (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Confined - Information indicates a low potential for contamination to a (Place an "X" next to one below) MIGRATION Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that Evident contamination in the media is present at, is moving potential point of exposure (could be due to the presence PATHWAY of geological structures or or physical controls) FACTOR toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Evident: (MPF) Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential: Potential to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined Confined: Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) RECEPTOR Receptors identified that have access to sediment Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to sediment Identified -FACTOR Identified: (RF) Potential: Potential for receptors to have access to sediment Potential -Limited: Brief Rationale for Selection: Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS Site Name: SITE 00002 Sediment Marine Category: (High, Medium, Low)

RELATIVE RISK EVALUATION WORKSHEET

					,	
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year)): 3/4/96				
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sedi	ment, Soil): <u>GW S</u>	OIL			
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00003	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):					
RMIS Site Type: LANDFILL	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a	greement e.g., FFA, I	Permit, Order) Yes			
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	<u>No</u>	Site Rank:	High		
	SITE SUMMARY	٠				
(Include only key elements of information use	ed to conduct the relative risk site evalu	ation. Attach map view	w of site if desired.)			
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	, and other relevant information):					
					Towards on	
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):						
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Ground Water			
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	,	Contaminant Lead Beryllium and compounds Chromium (total) Aluminum Antimony and compounds Chloroform Cadmium and compounds Dichloroethylene, 1,2- (mixture) Nickel and compounds Trichloroethylene (TCE) (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only	Maximum Coug/L 146.0 23.3 1,100.0 202,000.0 44.0 29.0 29.7 61.0 594.0 86.0		Standard ug/L 4.0 1.6 180.0 37,000.0 15.0 16.0 18.0 55.0 730.0 160.0	Ratio (2) 36.500 14.560 6.030 5.530 3.010 1.810 1.620 1.110 0.810 0.540	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): X Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential - Brief Rationale	contamination in the media is moving away from the source. Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined			Information indicates that the pol contaminant migration from the geological structures or physical	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:	
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified - Potential - Brief Rationale	There is a threatened or potentially threatened downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I). There is no potentially threatened water supp of the source. The groundwater is potentially irrigation or agriculture, but not presently use of or Selection:	or not) is a current or IIA aquifer). ly well downgradient usable for DW,	Limited -		i water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of c (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited:
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name:	SITE 00003		Groundwater Category: (High, Medium, Low)	High

				Soil			
ONTAMINANT	•	Contaminant	Maximum Co	nc.	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
			6.0		22.0	0.270	
ACTOR (1)		Arsenic (cancer endpoint)	24.4		400.0	0.060	(Place an "X" next to one below)
HF)		Lead	18.4		3,000.0	0.050	- (Trace arr X riext to one below)
		Chromium (total)				0.030	Simificant (If Total > 100)
		Nickel and compounds	8.6		1,500.0	0.000	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Zine	67.4		23,000.0	_	
		Copper and compounds	7.3		2,800.0	0,000	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
							Minimal (If Total < 2):
					· ·		
					m. i	0,393	
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only	ı		Total:	0.393	
		(2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed			Ł		
		rote. Only top ten contaminants are displayed	•				
IGRATION	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate	es that	Confined.	Low possibility for contamination	to be present at	(Place an "X" next to one below)
	Evident -	contamination is present at, is moving towards		or migrate to a point of exposure			
PATHWAY FACTOR		moved to a point of exposure	, 01 1125		, p		Evident:
IPF)		moved to a point of exposure					
If F)	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at o	e migrate				Potential: X
	Potential -	to a point of exposure; or information is not su					
		to make a determination of Evident or Confine					Confined:
		to make a determination of Evident or Confine	id.				Commed.
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
							(Place an "X" next to one below)
ECEPTOR	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to		Limited -			
ACTOR		contaminated soil			contaminated soil		Identified:
(F)			•				
/							Potential: X
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to					
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	contaminated soil					Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/4/96
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SWH SEDEM SOIL
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00004	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):
RMIS Site Type: LANDFILL	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High
	SITE SUMMARY
(Include only key elements of information used	d to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	and other relevant information):
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):	
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):	
Bilet Description of Receptors (Admini and Development)	

(or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

(1) Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination

Page 1 - Relative Risk Evaluation Worksheet

			Gı	round Water			
ONTAMINAN' AZARD ACTOR (1) CHF)	г	Contaminant Arsenic (cancer endpoint) Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (H Trichloroethane, 1,1,1- Mercury and compounds (inorganic) RDX (Cyclonite) Zine Trichloroethylene (TCE) Barium and compounds Dichloroethylene, 1,1- Cadmium and compounds (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.	Maximum Conc ug/L 20.6 MX) 1.1 2.0 0.19 3.3 735.0 17.0 287.0 1.0 5.2		Standard ug/L 0.0 1,825.0 1,300.0 11.0 61.0 10,950.0 160.0 2,555.0 4.6 18.3 Total:	Ratio (2) 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.020 0.050 0.070 0.110 0.110 0.220 0.280 32.618	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION ATHWAY ACTOR MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination in the media is moving away from Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suft to make a determination of Evident or Confined	m the source. migrate ficient	con	rmation indicates that the pote aminant migration from the se ogical structures or physical c	ource is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR RF)	Identified -	There is a threatened or potentially threatened or downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. or drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I or There is no potentially threatened water supply of the source. The groundwater is potentially u irrigation or agriculture, but not presently used e for Selection:	not) is a current IIA aquifer). well downgradient sable for DW,	the	source. The groundwater is n	water supply well downgradient of ot considered a potential source of (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited:
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: SI	ITE 00004		Groundwater Category:	<u>High</u>

•

CONTAMINANT IAZARD ACTOR (I) CHF)		Contaminant Trichloroethane, 1,1,1- Methylene chloride Fluoranthene Benzo(k)fluoranthene Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) Dinitrotoluene, 2,4- Nickel and compounds Barium and compounds Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HN Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg 0.023 0.086 2.0 0.95 5.3 0.43 7.9 91.8 MX) 58.0 92.6	Standard mg/Kg 1,900.0 490.0 2,600.0 610.0 3,200.0 130.0 1,500.0 5,300.0 3,300.0 4,800.0 Total:	Ratio (2) 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.010 0.020 0.020 0.020 3.968	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
ACTOR (I) CHF)		Trichloroethane, 1,1,1- Methylene chloride Fluoranthene Benzo[k]fluoranthene Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) Dinitrotoluene, 2,4- Nickel and compounds Barium and compounds Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HN Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	0.023 0.086 2.0 0.95 5.3 0.43 7.9 91.8 4X) 58.0	1,900.0 490.0 2,600.0 610.0 3,200.0 130.0 1,500.0 5,300.0 3,300.0 4,800.0	0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.010 0.020 0.020	Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
CHF)		Methylene chloride Fluoranthene Benzo[k]fluoranthene Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) Dinitrotoluene, 2,4- Nickel and compounds Barium and compounds Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HN Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	0.086 2.0 0.95 5.3 0.43 7.9 91.8 4X) 58.0	490.0 2,600.0 610.0 3,200.0 130.0 1,500.0 5,300.0 3,300.0 4,800.0	0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.010 0.020 0.020	Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		Fluoranthene Benzo[k]fluoranthene Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) Dinitrotoluene, 2,4- Nickel and compounds Barium and compounds Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HN Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	2.0 0.95 5.3 0.43 7.9 91.8 4X) 58.0	2,600.0 610.0 3,200.0 130.0 1,500.0 5,300.0 3,300.0 4,800.0	0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.010 0.020 0.020	Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
IGRATION Evi		Benzo[k]fluoranthene Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) Dinitrotoluene, 2,4- Nickel and compounds Barium and compounds Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HN Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	0.95 5.3 0.43 7.9 91.8 4X) 58.0	610.0 3,200.0 130.0 1,500.0 5,300.0 3,300.0 4,800.0	0.000 0.000 0.000 0.010 0.020 0.020 0.020	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
GRATION EVI		Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) Dinitrotoluene, 2,4- Nickel and compounds Barium and compounds Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HN Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	5.3 0.43 7.9 91.8 4X) 58.0	3,200.0 130.0 1,500.0 5,300.0 3,300.0 4,800.0	0,000 0,000 0,010 0,020 0,020 0,020	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
IGRATION EVI		Dinitrotoluene, 2,4- Nickel and compounds Barium and compounds Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HN Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	0.43 7.9 91.8 4X) 58.0	130.0 1,500.0 5,300.0 3,300.0 4,800.0	0.010 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020	
GRATION EVI		Nickel and compounds Barium and compounds Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HM Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	7.9 91.8 MX) 58.0	1,500.0 5,300.0 3,300.0 4,800.0	0.020 0.020 0.020	
UGRATION EVI		Barium and compounds Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HM Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	91.8 MX) 58.0	5,300.0 3,300.0 4,800.0	0.020 0.020	Minimal (If Total < 2):
GRATION EVICE		Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HM Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	MX) 58.0	3,300.0 4,800.0	0.020 0.020	
IGRATION EVICE		Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard		4,800.0	0.020	
IGRATION EVICENCE		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	3 2.0			
UGRATION EVI		(2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard		Total:	3.968	
AIGRATION Evi						
ATHWAY ACTOR MPF)	vident - otential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination is present at, is moving towards, of moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suffit to make a determination of Evident or Confined	or has	ined - Low possibility for contamination to or migrate to a point of exposure	be present at	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X Confined:
Brie	rief Rationale	for Selection:				
RECEPTOR Ide FACTOR RF)	lentified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil	Lin	nited - Little or no potential for receptors to contaminated soil	have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X
Pot	otential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Limited:
Brie	rief Rationale	e for Selection:				
			<u></u>			·

			Surface Water	Human		
CONTAMINANT IAZARD FACTOR (1)		Contaminant Arsenic (cancer endpoint)	Maximum Conc. ug/L 43.4	Standard ug/L 0.0	Ratio (2)	
CHF)		Dinitrotoluene, 2,4- Nickel and compounds	0.44 29.0	73.0 730.0	0.010 0.040	(Place an "X" next to one below)
		Chromium (total) Zinc	46.0 3,880,0	182.5 10,950.0	0.250 0.350	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Mercury and compounds (inorganic)	5.56 11.6	11.0	0.510 0.630	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		Cadmium and compounds Beryllium and compounds	2.2 44.1	1.6	1.380 3.020	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Antimony and compounds Lead	215.0	4.0	53.750	¥ 4 7-07
		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 		Total:	59.937	
IGRATION ATHWAY ACTOR	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is present at, is mov toward, or has moved to a point of exposure		ned - Information indicates a low poten to a potential point of exposure (c presence of geological structures	could by due to the	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident:
(PF)	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suff to make a determination of Evident or Confined	icient			Potential: X Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:				
ECEPTOR ACTOR (F)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surface	water Limi	ted - Little or no potential for receptor surface water	s to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to surface	water			Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
ctivity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: SITE 0000	4 Surfa	ace Water Human Category:	Med

Surface Water Eco Marine Standard CONTAMINANT Maximum Conc. mg/Kg Ratio (2) HAZARD Contaminant mg/Kg 0.0 FACTOR (1) Mercury and compounds (inorganic) 0.34 (Place an "X" next to one below) 0.056 0.0 (CHF) DDT 0.015 2.0 0.010 0.290 Significant (If Total > 100): 9.7 33.0 Arsenic (cancer endpoint) 0.380 Chromium (total) 30.6 80.0 0.480 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): 33.6 70.0 Copper and compounds 0.600 Cadmium and compounds 2.99 5.0 Minimal (If Total < 2): DDD,4,4-0.91 0.001 0.910 32.5 35.0 0.930 Lead 30.0 1.120 Nickel and compounds 33,6 Total: 36.271 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. (Place an "X" next to one below) Confined - Information indicates a low potential for contamination to a Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that MIGRATION Evident potential point of exposure (could be due to the presence PATHWAY contamination in the media is present at, is moving toward, or has moved to a point of exposure of geological structures or or physical controls) Evident: FACTOR (MPF) Potential: Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient Confined: to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to sediment Receptors identified that have access to sediment RECEPTOR Identified -Identified: FACTOR (RF) Potential: Potential for receptors to have access to sediment Potential -Limited: Brief Rationale for Selection: Sediment Marine Category: Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS Site Name: SITE 00004

(High, Medium, Low)

•				
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year):			
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sedimo	ent, Soil):		
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00005	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, R	RD/RA, or equiv. RC	RA Stage):	
RMIS Site Type: STORAGE AREA	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agr	eement e.g., FFA, Pe	ermit, Order) Yes	
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank:	NRB
	SITE SUMMARY			
(Include only key elements of information use	d to conduct the relative risk site evaluati	on. Attach map view	of site if desired.)	
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):	, and other relevant information):	÷		
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):				

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

·	
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/4/96
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SWH SEDEM SOIL
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00006	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):
RMIS Site Type: CONTAMINATED GROUND WATER	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High
	SITE SUMMARY
(Include only key elements of informatio	n used to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation)	ation, and other relevant information):
·	
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil	I):
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):	

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Ground Wate	r		
CONTAMINANT IAZARD PACTOR (I) CHF)	Γ	Contaminant Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HN Cadmium and compounds RDX (Cyclonite) Dichloroethylene, 1,2- (mixture) Trichloroethylene (TCE) Dichloroethylene, 1,1- Antimony and compounds (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	Maximum Co ug/L MX) 7.6 4.5 17.0 86.0 380.0 16.0 57.2	nc.	Standard ug/L 1,825.0 18.3 61.0 55.0 160.0 4.6 14.6	Ratio (2) 0.000 0.250 0.280 1.560 2.380 3.480 3.920	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): X Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is moving away from Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suff to make a determination of Evident or Confined	n the source. migrate icient	Confined ·	Information indicates that the po- contaminant migration from the geological structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR RF)	Identified - Potential -	There is a threatened or potentially threatened w downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. or a drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I or There is no potentially threatened water supply of the source. The groundwater is potentially us irrigation or agriculture, but not presently used (see for Selection:	not) is a current IIA aquifer). well downgradient sable for DW,	Limited	the source. The groundwater is	d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of e (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited:
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name:	SITE 00006		Groundwater Category: (High, Medium, Low)	High

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Soil		
CONTAMINANT		Contaminant	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
IAZARD		Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP)	0.45	3,200.0	0.000	
ACTOR (1)		Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (Hi		3,300.0	0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below)
CHF)		Copper and compounds	5.5	2,800.0	0.000	
		RDX (Cyclonite)	2.9	400.0	0.010	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Zinc	214.0	23,000.0	0.010	
		Chromium (total)	25.1	380.0	0.070	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100);
		Lead	50.3	400.0	0.130	7
		Arsenic (cancer endpoint)	6,4	22.0	0.290	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Arsenic (cancer endpoint)	0.4	22.0		
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard		Tota	d: 0.503	
		Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.			,	
(MPF)	Potential - Brief Rational	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suff to make a determination of Evident or Confined of For Selection:	icient			Potential: X Confined:
		•				(Place an "X" next to one below)
			,			(Place all X hext to one below)
RECEPTOR	Identified •	Receptors identified that have access to		Limited - Little or no potential for rece	ptors to have access to	Identified:
ACTOR		contaminated soil		contaminated soil		Identified:
RF)						Potential: X
						rotentiar:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
					Soil Categ	

Surface Water Human Standard Maximum Conc. CONTAMINANT HAZARD Contaminant ug/L ug/L Ratio (2) 11.0 0.020 Mercury and compounds (inorganic) 0.21 FACTOR (I) 50.3 1,355.7 0.040 (Place an "X" next to one below) Copper and compounds (CHF) 554.0 10,950.0 0.050 Zinc 0.120 84.2 730.0 Significant (If Total > 100): Nickel and compounds 182.5 0.340 Chromium (total) 61.2 4.0 19.700 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Lead 78.8 Minimal (If Total < 2): Total: 20.257 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. (Place an "X" next to one below) Confined - Information indicates a low potential for contamination Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that MIGRATION Evident to a potential point of exposure (could by due to the PATHWAY contamination in the media is present at, is moving presence of geological structures or physical controls) Evident: FACTOR toward, or has moved to a point of exposure (MPF) Potential: Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential • to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient Confined: to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to RECEPTOR Receptors identified that have access to surface water Identified surface water Identified: FACTOR (RF) Potential: Potential for receptors to have access to surface water Potential -Limited: Brief Rationale for Selection: Surface Water Human Category: Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS Site Name: (High, Medium, Low)

Surface Water Eco Marine Maximum Conc. Standard CONTAMINANT mg/Kg Ratio (2) Contaminant mg/Kg HAZARD 0.000 400.0 FACTOR (1) Benzo[a]pyrene 0.31 (Place an "X" next to one below) 0.84 600.0 0,000 Fluoranthene (CHF) 350.0 0.000 0.93 Pyrene Significant (If Total > 100): 1.180 Chromium (total) 94.8 70.0 1.860 130.0 Copper and compounds 35.0 1,950 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): 68.1 1.960 Cadmium and compounds 9.8 5.0 30.0 3.330 Minimal (If Total < 2): 100.0 Nickel and compounds 5.360 120.0 643.0 Zinc 24.100 2.0 Antimony and compounds Total: 39.744 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. (Place an "X" next to one below) Confined - Information indicates a low potential for contamination to a Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that MIGRATION Evident potential point of exposure (could be due to the presence PATHWAY contamination in the media is present at, is moving Evident: of geological structures or or physical controls) toward, or has moved to a point of exposure FACTOR (MPF) Potential: Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient Confined: to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to sediment Receptors identified that have access to sediment RECEPTOR Identified • Identified: FACTOR (RF) Potential: Potential -Potential for receptors to have access to sediment Limited: Brief Rationale for Selection: Sediment Marine Category: Site Name: SITE 00006 Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS (High, Medium, Low)

•				
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year)	3/4/96		
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sedir	nent, Soil): <u>GW S</u>	SWH SEDEM SOIL	
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00007	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv,	RD/RA, or equiv. R	CRA Stage):	
RMIS Site Type: DRAINAGE DITCH	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of ag	reement e.g., FFA,	Permit, Order) Yes	
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank:	High
	SITE SUMMARY			
(Include only key elements of information use	d to conduct the relative risk site evalua	tion. Attach map vie	w of site if desired.)	
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	and other relevant information):			
Zici Dio Della (invada dio Sper) mana corporate di particolori	,			
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):				
Bird Bescription of Latinages (Octobination, Business Francis, Business, Bus				
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):				
offer Description of Receptors (Ituman and Ecological).				
		•		

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

			(Ground Wate	r		the state of the s
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	т	Contaminant Dinitrotoluene, 2,6- Mercury and compounds (inorganic) Nitrobenzene Dichloroethane, 1,1- Zine Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (Nickel and compounds Cadmium and compounds Aluminum Chromium (total) (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standar Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed	328.0 12.6 126,000.0 636.0	nc.	Standard ug/L 3,700.0 11.0 18.3 810.0 10,950.0 1,825.0 730.0 18.3 36,500.0 182.5	Ratio (2) 0.010 0.020 0.030 0.070 0.090 0.100 0.450 0.690 3.450 3.480	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100):X Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indica contamination in the media is moving away for Possibility for contamination to be present at to a point of exposure; or information is not s to make a determination of Evident or Confin	tes that rom the source. or migrate ufficient	Confined -	Information indicates that the pot contaminant migration from the s geological structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified - Potential -	There is a threatened or potentially threatened downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. of drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I of the source). The groundwater is potentially irrigation or agriculture, but not presently use e for Selection:	or not) is a current or IIA aquifer). Iy well downgradient usable for DW,	Limited -	•	d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of c (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: X Potential: Limited:
Activity Name	e: <u>YORKTOWN</u>	I VA NWS	Site Name:	SITE 00007		Groundwater Category: (High, Medium, Low)	High

-

PATHWAY contamination is present at, is moving towards, or has or migrate to a point of exposure Evident: FACTOR moved to a point of exposure (MPF) Potential - Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection:				So	bil		
MIGRATION PATHWAY contamination is present at, is moving towards, or has moved to a point of exposure moved to a point of exposure moved to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection: RECEPTOR Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that contamination to be present at, is moving towards, or has or migrate to a point of exposure Evident: Potential - Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate to a point of exposure Formula: Brief Rationale for Selection: RECEPTOR Identified - Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil Potential - Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil Potential - Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil Limited: Limited: Limited: Limited: Limited: Limited:	HAZARD FACTOR (1)	г	Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) Zinc Nickel and compounds Chromium (total) Beryllium and compounds Arsenic (cancer endpoint) (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only	mg/Kg 0.53 31.9 9.1 13.6 0.8	mg/Kg 3,200.0 23,000.0 1,500.0 380.0 14.0 22.0	0.000 0.000 0.010 0.040 0.060 0.100	Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
ECEPTOR Identified - Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil Cont	ATHWAY ACTOR	Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination is present at, is moving towards, moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suf to make a determination of Evident or Confined	or has migrate Ticlent		to be present at	Potential: X
	ACTOR	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil Potential for receptors to have access to	L		to have access to	Potential: X
		Brief Rational					

			Surface Wate	er Human		
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (I) (CHF)	г	Contaminant Trichloroethane, 1,1,1- Mercury and compounds (inorganic) Zinc Nickel and compounds Copper and compounds Dichloroethane, 1,1- Chromium (total) Lead (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		Standard ug/I, 1,300.0 11.0 10,950.0 730.0 1,355.7 810.0 182.5 4.0 Total:	Ratio (2) 0.010 0.020 0.050 0.060 0.100 0.300 0.430 28.500	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination in the media is present at, is mortoward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suit to make a determination of Evident or Confine	ring migrate ficient	ined - Information indicates a low poten to a potential point of exposure (c presence of geological structures of	ould by due to the	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surface	water Lim	ulted - Little or no potential for receptors surface water	to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to surface	water			Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	I VA NWS	Site Name: SITE 0000	07 Surfac	ce Water Human Catego	

	7.7		Surface V	Vater Eco Marine		
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (I) (CHF)	Γ	Contaminant Copper and compounds Cadmium and compounds Lead Zinc Antimony and compounds	Maximum Cone, mg/Kg 79.4 5.8 95.3 403.0 30.4	Standard mg/Kg 70.0 5.0 35.0 120.0 2.0	Ratio (2) 1,130 1,160 2,720 3,360 15,200	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		Total:	23.575	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is present at, is movi toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or a to a point of exposure; or information is not suffit to make a determination of Evident or Confined	ng migrate	Confined - Information indicates a low potential point of exposure (cou of geological structures or or ph	ld be due to the presence	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to sedimen	t	Limited - Little or no potential for receptor	ors to have access to sediment	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to sedimen	ıt			Potential: X Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: <u>SIT</u>	E 00007	Sediment Marine Category: (High, Medium, Low)	Med

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS Location (State): VA Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00008 RMIS Site Type: DRAINAGE DITCH Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/4/96 Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SWH SEDEM SOIL Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage): Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High
	SITE SUMMARY d to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	and other relevant information):
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):	
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):	

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

ł

			((1)	Ground Water	7	The state of the s	
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	т	Contaminant Lead Beryllium and compounds RDX (Cyclonite) Chromium (total) Aluminum Trichloroethylene (TCE) Zinc Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (H	Maximum Co ug/L 20.2 4.5 64.0 163.0 27,700.0 15.0 216.0 MX) 13.0	onc.	Standard ug/L 4.0 1.6 61.0 180.0 37,000.0 160.0 11,000.0 1.800.0	Ratio (2) 5.050 2.810 1.050 0.890 0.760 0.090 0.020 0.010	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 			Total:	10.684	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is moving away from	Confined -	Information indicates that the po- contaminant migration from the geological structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X	
(MPF)	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined					Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:					
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	There is a threatened or potentially threatened w downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. or drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I or	Limited •	There is no potentially threatene the source. The groundwater is DW or is of limited benificial us	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: X Potential:		
	Potential -	There is no potentially threatened water supply of the source. The groundwater is potentially useringation or agriculture, but not presently used to			Limited:		
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:					
Activity Name	e: <u>YORKTOWN</u>	VA NWS	Site Name:	SITE 00008		Groundwater Category: (High, Medium, Low)	<u>High</u>

			So	il		
CONTAMINANT HAZARD		Contaminant	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg 62.7	Standard mg/Kg 400,0	Ratio (2) 0.160	
ACTOR (1)		Lead Arsenic (cancer endpoint)	2.6	22.0	0.120	(Place an "X" next to one below)
CHF)		Vanadium	29.8	540.0	0.060	(**************************************
		Vinyl chloride	0,009	0.52	0.050	Significant (If Total > 100):
		RDX (Cyclonite)	3.4	400,0	0.010	
		Nickel and compounds	12.4	1,500,0	0.010	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		Copper and compounds	20.6	2,800.0	0.010	
		Zinc	165.0 .	23,000.0	0.010	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Dieldrin	0.003	2.8	0.000	
		Dichloroethylene, 1,2- (mixture)	0.09	75.0	0.000	
		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 		Total:	0.417	
NIGRATION ATHWAY ACTOR	Evident •	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination is present at, is moving towards, moved to a point of exposure		nfined - Low possibility for contamination to or migrate to a point of exposure	be present at	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident:
MPF)	Potential •	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suf to make a determination of Evident or Confined	ficient			Potential: X Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:				
		n i transferia	T:	imited - Little or no potential for receptors to	have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below)
RECEPTOR FACTOR RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil	k.n	contaminated soil		Identified:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Potential: X Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
					S-2 C-4	
Activity Name:	YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: SITE 00	XXX8	Soil Category (High, Medium, Low)	: Low

			Surface Water I	Human		
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	Т	Contaminant Lead Nickel and compounds Copper and compounds (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	Maximum Conc. ug/I, 31.5 21.3 6.1	Standard ug/L 4.0 730.0 1,400.0	Ratio (2) 7.880 0.030 0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Analytical data or observable evidence indicates the contamination in the media is present at, is moving toward, or has moved to a point of exposure. Possibility for contamination to be present at or meto a point of exposure; or information is not suffice to make a determination of Evident or Confined.	grate	d - Information indicates a low poter to a potential point of exposure (or presence of geological structures	could by due to the	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified - Potential -	Receptors identified that have access to surface we Potential for receptors to have access to surface we		d - Little or no potential for receptor surface water	s to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X Limited:
Activity Name		e for Selection:	Site Name: <u>SITE 00008</u>	Surfa	nce Water Human Category:	: <u>M</u> ed

CONTAMINAN' IAZARD	r	Contaminant	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
ACTOR (1)		Lend	38.7	35.0	1.110	
CHF)		Zinc	125.0	120.0	1.040	(Place an "X" next to one below)
		Mercury and compounds (inorganic)	2.0	0.15		Significant (If Total > 100);
						Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
					-,	Minimal (If Total < 2):

		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 		Total:	2.147	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is present at, is movi toward, or has moved to a point of exposure		ned - Information indicates a low potenti potential point of exposure (could of geological structures or or physi	be due to the presence	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident:
	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suff to make a determination of Evident or Confined	icient			Potential: X Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
RECEPTOR 'ACTOR RF)	Identified •	Receptors identified that have access to sedimen	it Limi	ited - Little or no potential for receptors	to have access to sediment	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to sedimen	ut .	,		Potential: X
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				

·						
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/4/96					
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SWH SWEF SEDEM SOIL					
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00009	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):					
RMIS Site Type: DRAINAGE DITCH	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes					
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High					
	SITE SUMMARY					
(Include only key elements of information use	d to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)					
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	, and other relevant information):					
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):						
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

Ground Water Maximum Conc. Standard CONTAMINANT ug/L Ratio (2) HAZARD Contaminant Dinitrotoluene, 2,4-12.0 73.0 0.160 FACTOR (1) 0.170 (Place an "X" next to one below) Mercury and compounds (inorganic) 1.82 11.0 (CHF) Nickel and compounds 164.0 730.0 0.220 0.320 18.3 Significant (If Total > 100): Cadmium and compounds 5.8 0.360 Zinc 3,940.0 10,950.0 2,555.0 0.810 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): 2.070.0 Barium and compounds 299.0 182.5 1.640 Chromium (total) 85,300.0 36,500.0 2,340 Minimal (If Total < 2): Aluminum 3.500 1.8 Trinitrobenzene, 1,3,5-6.3 2,300.0 220.0 10.450 Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6-97,784 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only Total: (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Confined - Information indicates that the potential for (Place an "X" next to one below) MIGRATION Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that Evident contaminant migration from the source is limited (due to contamination in the media is moving away from the source. PATHWAY geological structures or physical controls) Evident: FACTOR (MPF) Potential: Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined Confined: Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) Limited - There is no potentially threatened water supply well downgradient of RECEPTOR Identified -There is a threatened or potentially threatened water supply downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. or not) is a current the source. The groundwater is not considered a potential source of Identified: FACTOR DW or is of limited benificial use (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer). (RF) drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I or IIA aquifer). Potential: There is no potentially threatened water supply well downgradient Potential of the source. The groundwater is potentially usable for DW, Limited: irrigation or agriculture, but not presently used (Class IIB aquifer). Brief Rationale for Selection: Site Name: Groundwater Category: High Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS SITE 00009 (High, Medium, Low)

Soil Maximum Conc. Standard CONTAMINANT mg/Kg Ratio (2) mg/Kg Contaminant HAZARD 0.000 2,600.0 1.1 FACTOR (I) Fluoranthene 0.010 (Place an "X" next to one below) 8.6 1,500.0 Nickel and compounds (CHF) 175.0 23,000.0 0.010 Zinc 0.010 Significant (If Total > 100): 2,800.0 23.5 Copper and compounds 0.010 0.55 61.0 Benz[a]anthracene 0.010 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): 61.0 0.62 Benzo[b]fluoranthene 0.020 24.0 0.59 Chrysene 130.0 0.020 Minimal (If Total < 2): Dinitrotoluene, 2,4-3.2 0.040 23.0 Mercury and compounds (inorganic) 1.01 19.3 380.0 0.050 Chromium (total) 2.763 Total: (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. (Place an "X" next to one below) Confined - Low possibility for contamination to be present at Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that MIGRATION Evident or migrate to a point of exposure PATHWAY contamination is present at, is moving towards, or has Evident: moved to a point of exposure FACTOR (MPF) Potential: Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient Confined: to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to Receptors identified that have access to RECEPTOR Identified -Identified: contaminated soil contaminated soil FACTOR (RF) Potential: Potential for receptors to have access to Potential -Limited: contaminated soil Brief Rationale for Selection: Soil Category: Med Site Name: SITE 00009 Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS (High, Medium, Low)

		464-264-244-244-244-244-244-244-244-244-	Surface Wat	er Human		
					,	 1
CONTAMINANT	r		Maximum Conc.	Standard	D. 41. (2)	
HAZARD		Contaminant	ug/L	ug/L 3,700.0	Ratio (2) 0.000	_
ACTOR (1)		Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-	0.29	73.0	0.010	(Place an "X" next to one below)
CHF)		Dinitrotoluene, 2,4- Dichloroethane, 1,1-	0.38	810.0	0.010	(Flace all A llext to one below)
			18.0	1,300.0	0.010	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Trichloroethane, 1,1,1-	19.8	4.0	4.950	Biginiteant (It Total > 100).
		Lead	12,0			Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
						Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standar Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed		Total:	4.977	
MIGRATION	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indica	es that Con	fined - Information indicates a low pote	ential for contamination	(Place an "X" next to one below)
ATHWAY	Evident -	contamination in the media is present at, is me		to a potential point of exposure	(could by due to the	•
		toward, or has moved to a point of exposure	8	presence of geological structure		Evident:
ACTOR MPF)					•	
,	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at	or migrate			Potential: X
		to a point of exposure; or information is not st to make a determination of Evident or Confin				Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
						(Place an "X" next to one below)
RECEPTOR	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surface	e water Lir	nited - Little or no potential for recepto	ors to have access to	•
ACTOR	Tachimea -			surface water		Identified:
RF)						
,						Potential: X
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to surface	ce water			
						Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
A ativitu Nama	: YORKTOWN	I VA NWS	Site Name: SITE 000	009 Surf	ace Water Human Cate	gory: Med

			Surface Wate	er Eco Fresh		
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (I) CHF)	г	Contaminant Trichloroethanc, 1,1,1- Dinitrotoluene, 2,6- Dichloroethane, 1,1- Dinitrotoluene, 2,4- Lead	Maximum Conc. ug/L 18.0 0.29 6.0 0.38 19.8	Standard ug/L 0.0 0.0 0.0 230.0 3.2	0.000 6.190	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100); Moderate (If Total 2 - 100); Minimal (If Total < 2);
		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 		Total:	6.189	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination in the media is present at, is mortoward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not sure to make a determination of Evident or Confine	ring : migrate ficient	nfined - Information indicates a low pot- to a potential point of exposure presence of geological structure	(could be due to the	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rational	ie for Selection:				
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surface	water Li	imited - Little or no potential for recepto surface water	rs to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified:X Potential:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to surface	e water			Limited:
	Brief Rational	le for Selection:				:
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	v va nws	Site Name: SITE 00	0009 Su	rface Water Fresh Category: (High, Medium, Low)	High

			Surface Water	Eco Marine		
ONTAMINANT AZARD ACTOR (1) CHF)	•	Contaminant Mercury and compounds (inorganic) Acenaphthene	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg 0.55 1.6 6.0	Standard mg/Kg 0.0 150.0 400.0	Ratio (2) 0.010 0.010	(Place an "X" next to one below)
		Benzo[a]pyrene Fluoranthene Chrysene	10.0 8.6 1.5	600.0 400.0 60,0	0.020 0.020 0.030	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Dibenz[ah]anthracene Anthracene Benz[a]anthracene Pyrene	2.3 7.5 12.0	85.0 230.0 350.0	0.030 0.030 0.030	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.	9.1	225.0 Total:	13.970	
IIGRATION ATHWAY ACTOR MPF)	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is present at, is movi toward, or has moved to a point of exposure		fined - Information indicates a low potential potential point of exposure (could be of geological structures or or physic	e due to the presence	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X
,	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suff to make a determination of Evident or Confined				Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:				
ECEPTOR ACTOR F)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to sedimen	t Lir	nited - Little or no potential for receptors to	o have access to sediment	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: X Potential:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to sedimer	t			Limited:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:				
ctivity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: <u>SITE 000</u>	009 Se	ediment Marine Category: (High, Medium, Low)	High

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year):					
Location (State): VA	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil):						
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00010	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remy, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):						
RMIS Site Type: SURFACE DISPOSAL AREA	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a	igreement e.g., FFA,	Permit, Order) Yes				
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank:	NRB			
	SITE SUMMARY	·					
(Include only key elements of information use	ed to conduct the relative risk site evalu	ation. Attach map vie	w of site if desired.)				
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	n, and other relevant information):				Signal		
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):							
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):							

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/4/96					
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SWEF SOIL					
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00011	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):					
RMIS Site Type: BURN AREA	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes					
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High					
	SITE SUMMARY					
(Include only key elements of information use	ed to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)					
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	i, and other relevant information):					
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):						
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contaminatio (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

			Ground Wate	er		
ONTAMINANI IAZARD	г	Maximum Conc. Contaminant ug/L		Standard ug/L	Ratio (2)	
ACTOR (1)		Arsenic (cancer endpoint)	90.3	0.0		
(CHF)		Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HMX) 4.2		1,825.0	0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below)
		Zinc	134.0	10,950.0	0.010	0) (8 . (74
		Aluminum	14,500.0	36,500.0 61.0	0.400 0.460	Significant (If Total > 100):
				182.5	0.480	No. downer (TETT-4-12, 100).
		Chromium (total)	10.3	182.5	0.480	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		Cadmium and compounds Lead	20.7	4.0	5.180	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Lead	20.7	4.0	3.180	Minima (It Total < 2):
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only		Total:	7.092	
		(2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		L		
PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate		Information indicates that the potential for		(Place an "X" next to one below)
	contamination in the media is moving away from the source.			contaminant migration from the sou geological structures or physical cor	Evident:	
	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not su to make a determination of Evident or Confine	fficient			Potential: X Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
		m i di a la cella di assault		There is no potentially threatened w	oter county well downgradient of	(Place an "X" next to one below)
ECEPTOR ACTOR RF)	Identified -	There is a threatened or potentially threatened downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. or drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I or	not) is a current	the source. The groundwater is not DW or is of limited benificial use (I	Identified:	
XI')		•	•		Potential: X	
	Potential -	There is no potentially threatened water supply of the source. The groundwater is potentially irrigation or agriculture, but not presently used	isable for DW,			Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: SITE 00011		Groundwater Category:	<u>Med</u>

				Soil		
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	г	Contaminant Copper and compounds Barium and compounds	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg 26.5	Standard mg/Kg 2,800.0 5,300.0	Ratio (2) 0.010 0.020	(Place an "X" next to one below)
(CIII)		Various mile compounds	70.2			Significant (If Total > 100):
						Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standar Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed			Total: 2.80E-02	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indica contamination is present at, is moving toward moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at to a point of exposure; or information is not sto make a determination of Evident or Confin	or migrate	Confined - Low possibility for cont or migrate to a point of		(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:				
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil		Limited - Little or no potential for contaminated soil	receptors to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: X Potential:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: <u>SIT</u>	E 00011	Soil Category (High, Medium, Low)	: High

			Surfac	ce Water Eco	Fresh		
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD FACTOR (I) (CHF)	т	Contaminant Nickel and compounds Arsenic (cancer endpoint) Chromium (total) Zinc Copper and compounds Lead Mercury and compounds (inorganic) (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	Maximum Con ug/L 61.9 143.0 71.6 904.0 258.0 300.0 1.46	ne.	Standard ug/L 160.0 190.0 11.0 110.0 12.0 3.2 0.012	Ratio (2) 0.390 0.750 6.510 8.220 21.500 93.750 121.670	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100):X Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential - Brief Rational	Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is present at, is movi toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or r to a point of exposure; or information is not suffit to make a determination of Evident or Confined e for Selection:	ng migrate		Information indicates a low poto a potential point of exposur presence of geological structure	e (could be due to the	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified •	Receptors identified that have access to surface of the surface of		Limited -	Little or no potential for recep surface water	tors to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: X Potential: Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	I VA NWS	Site Name:	SITE 00011	s	urface Water Fresh Category: (High, Medium, Low)	High

·					
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year				
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sed				
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00012	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remy	, RD/RA, or equiv.	RCRA Stage):		
RMIS Site Type: LANDFILL	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a	agreement e.g., FFA	A, Permit, Order) Yes		
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank:	High	water and the second se
	SITE SUMMARY				
(Include only key elements of information use	ed to conduct the relative risk site evalu	uation. Attach map v	riew of site if desired.)		
					··
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	n, and other relevant information):				
					1
					FS
•					
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):					
					•
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):					
(1) Hearta report information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk	k Site Evaluation. The term Site is defi	ined as a discrete are	a for which suspected co	ntamination has bee	n verified and requ

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

···				Ground Water	**************************************	M	aka ika alika historia da arawa a araw
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD	r	Contaminant	Maximum Co	one,	Standard ug/L	Ratio (2)	
FACTOR (1) (CHF)		Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6-	1.5 160.0	160.0	220.0 10,950.0	0.010 0.010	(Place an "X" next to one below)
		Acetone RDX (Cyclonite)	14.0		610.0	0.020 0.070	Significant (If Total > 100):
	Dichloroethylene, 1,2- (mixture) Chloroform		4.0		55.0 16.0	0.070 0.130	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		Trichloroethylene (TCE) Cadmium and compounds	55.0 7.4		160.0 18.3	0.340 0.400	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Chromium (total) Aluminum	82.2 17,200.0		182.5 36,500.0	0.450 0.470	
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standa Note: Only top ten contaminants are displaye			Total:	12.486	
PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that contamination in the media is moving away from the source. Confined - Information indicates that the potential for contaminant migration from the source is limited (due to geological structures or physical controls)				(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X	
	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined					Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:					
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	There is a threatened or potentially threatene downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I	or not) is a current	Limited •		d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of e (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X
	Potential -	There is no potentially threatened water supp of the source. The groundwater is potentially irrigation or agriculture, but not presently use	usable for DW,				Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	YA NWS	Site Name:	SITE 00012		Groundwater Category:	High

				Soil			
ONTAMINANT		Contaminant	Maximum Co mg/Kg	nc.	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
ACTOR (1)		DDD	0.35		190.0		
CHF)		Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP)	4.4		3,200.0	0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below)
,		Fluoranthene	4.1		2,600.0	0.000	
		Benzo[k]fluoranthene	1.5		610.0	0.000	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6-	15.0		4,800.0	0.000	
		Benz[a]anthracene	1.4		61.0	0.020	Moderate (If Total 2 • 100);
		DDE	3.6		130.0	0.030	_
		Benzo[b]fluoranthene	1.9		61.0	0.030	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Nickel and compounds	49.6		1,500.0	0.030	
		DDT	5.7		130.0	0.040	
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard			Total	6.891	
		Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.					
MIGRATION	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate		Low possibility for contaminat or migrate to a point of exposu		(Place an "X" next to one below)	
ATHWAY ACTOR MPF)		contamination is present at, is moving towards, moved to a point of exposure	or nas	Evident:			
mr,	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined					Potential: X Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
				Y imited	Little or no potential for recept	ors to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below)
RECEPTOR FACTOR RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil		Emmed -	contaminated soil	3.0 to nano accordin	Identified: X
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil					Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					

5. 11.)

Surface Water Human CONTAMINANT Maximum Conc. Standard HAZARD Contaminant Ratio (2) ug/L ug/L FACTOR (1) DDD 0.061 28.0 (CHF) 100.0 10.950.0 0.010 (Place an "X" next to one below) Zinc 1,355.7 0.010 Copper and compounds 15.1 Mercury and compounds (inorganic) 0.24 11.0 0.020 Significant (If Total > 100): DDT 0.46 20.0 0.020 Trichloroethylene (TCE) 4.0 160.0 0.030 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): 730.0 0.030 Nickel and compounds 19.0 Cadmium and compounds 15.5 18.3 0.850 Minimal (If Total < 2): Lead 42.0 4.0 10.500 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only Total: 11,463 (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that Confined - Information indicates a low potential for contamination (Place an "X" next to one below) MIGRATION Evident -PATHWAY contamination in the media is present at, is moving to a potential point of exposure (could by due to the presence of geological structures or physical controls) FACTOR toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Evident: (MPF) Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential: Potential • to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined Confined: Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to RECEPTOR Identified -Receptors identified that have access to surface water FACTOR surface water Identified: (RF) Potential: Potential for receptors to have access to surface water Potential -Limited: Brief Rationale for Selection: Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS Site Name: SITE 00012 Surface Water Human Category: Med (High, Medium, Low)

Surface Water Eco Fresh Standard Maximum Conc. CONTAMINANT ug/L Ratio (2) Contaminant ug/L HAZARD 0.061 0.0 DDD FACTOR (1) (Place an "X" next to one below) 21,900.0 0.000 4.0 Trichloroethylene (TCE) (CHF) 0.120 19.0 160.0 Nickel and compounds 0.910 Significant (If Total > 100): 110.0 100.0 Zinc 1,260 15.1 12.0 Copper and compounds 13.130 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): 3.2 42.0 Lead 14.090 1.1 15.5 Cadmium and compounds 20.000 Minimal (If Total < 2): 0.012 0.24 Mercury and compounds (inorganic) 460.000 0.001 0.46 DDT 509.502 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only Total: (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. (Place an "X" next to one below) Confined - Information indicates a low potential for contamination Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that MIGRATION Evident to a potential point of exposure (could be due to the contamination in the media is present at, is moving PATHWAY presence of geological structures or physical controls) Evident: toward, or has moved to a point of exposure FACTOR (MPF) Potential: Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient Confined: to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to Receptors identified that have access to surface water RECEPTOR Identified -Identified: surface water FACTOR (RF) Potential: Potential for receptors to have access to surface water Potential . Limited: Brief Rationale for Selection: Surface Water Fresh Category: High Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS Site Name: SITE 00012 (High, Medium, Low)

			Surface	e Water Eco Mai	rine		
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (I) (CHF)		Contaminant Mercury and compounds (inorganic) DDE Benzo[a]pyrene Chrysene Fluoranthene Pyrene Phenanthrene Benz[a]anthracene DDT DDD,4,4- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		nc.	Standard mg/Kg 0.0 0.0 400.0 400.0 400.0 500.0 225.0 230.0 2.0 0.001	0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.110 0.180	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that contamination in the media is present at, is moving toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined		po	formation indicates a low poter stential point of exposure (could geological structures or or phy	d be due to the presence	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to sedime	ent .	Limited - L	ittle or no potential for receptor	s to have access to sediment	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to sedim	ent				Potential: X Limited:
	Brief Rational	le for Selection:					
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	I VA NWS	Site Name:	SITE 00012		Sediment Marine Category:	Med

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year):						
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil):						
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00013	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remy	, RD/RA, or equiv.	RCRA Stage):	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·		
RMIS Site Type: SURFACE DISPOSAL AREA	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a	agreement e.g., FFA	, Permit, Order) Yes		.,		
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank:	NRB			
	SITE SUMMARY						
(Include only key elements of information use	d to conduct the relative risk site evalu	lation. Attach map vi	ew of site if desired.)				
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	, and other relevant information):						
					**		
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):							
		·					
		? .					
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):							
Stee Sescription of Acceptance (Steman and Stee Army).							
(1) Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program,	Site Evaluation. The term Site is definition or current in the state of the state o	ned as a discrete area nstallations. An AOC	for which suspected con I is a discrete area of con	tamination has been tamination, or suspe	verified and requeted contamination		

(or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

Page 1 - Relative Risk Evaluation Worksheet

•							
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year));					
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil):						
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00015	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):						
RMIS Site Type: SURFACE DISPOSAL AREA	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a	greement e.g., FFA, l	Permit, Order) Yes				
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank:	NRB			
	SITE SUMMARY						
(Include only key elements of information used	d to conduct the relative risk site evalua	ation. Attach map vie	w of site if desired.)				
	to the state of the state of						
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	, and other relevant information):						
		•					
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):							
			•				
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):							

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS Location (State): VA Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00016	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/4/96 Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SWH SWEF SEDEM SOIL Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):
RMIS Site Type: LANDFILL	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High
	SITE SUMMARY
(Include only key elements of information us	sed to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	on, and other relevant information):
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):	
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):	

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

Ground Water CONTAMINANT Maximum Conc. Standard HAZARD Contaminant ug/L ug/L Ratio (2) FACTOR (1) Arsenic (cancer endpoint) 17.8 0.0 (CHF) Phenol 1.0 21,900.0 0.000 (Place an "X" next to one below) Trichloroethane, 1.1.1-3.0 1.300.0 0.000 Dichloroethane, 1.1-3.0 810.0 0.000 Significant (If Total > 100); RDX (Cyclonite) 1.3 61.0 0.020 Mercury and compounds (inorganic) 0.25 11.0 0.020 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Zinc 376.0 10.950.0 0.030 Dichlorobenzene, 1,4-4.0 47.0 0.090 Minimal (If Total < 2): Barium and compounds 362.0 2,555.0 0.140 Chlorobenzene 6.0 39.0 0.150 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only Total: 27.916 (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. MIGRATION Evident -Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that Confined - Information indicates that the potential for (Place an "X" next to one below) PATHWAY contamination in the media is moving away from the source. contaminant migration from the source is limited (due to FACTOR geological structures or physical controls) Evident: (MPF) Potential -Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential: to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined Confined: Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) RECEPTOR Identified -There is a threatened or potentially threatened water supply Limited - There is no potentially threatened water supply well downgradient of FACTOR downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. or not) is a current the source. The groundwater is not considered a potential source of Identified: (RF) drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I or IIA aquifer). DW or is of limited benificial use (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer). Potential: Potential -There is no potentially threatened water supply well downgradient of the source. The groundwater is potentially usable for DW, Limited: irrigation or agriculture, but not presently used (Class IIB aquifer). Brief Rationale for Selection: Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS Site Name: Groundwater Category: SITE 00016 (High, Medium, Low)

				Soil			
ONTAMINANT			Maximum Con	ic.	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
AZARD		Contaminant	mg/Kg 0.002		190.0		
ACTOR (1)		DDD	0.002		130.0	0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below)
CHF)		DDT	0.002		130.0	0.000	
		DDE Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP)	0.59		3,200.0	0.000	Significant (If Total > 100):
			0.008		2.8	0.000	
		Dieldrin	36.8		5,300.0	0.010	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		Barium and compounds	18.3		1,500.0	0.010	
		Nickel and compounds	559.0		23,000.0	0.020	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Zinc	0,47		14.0	0.030	1
		Beryllium and compounds	1.08		23.0	0.050	
		Mercury and compounds (inorganic)	1.00			<u> </u>]
		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 			Total:	1.337	
MIGRATION Evident - PATHWAY FACTOR		Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination is present at, is moving towards, moved to a point of exposure			Low possibility for contamination or migrate to a point of exposure		(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident:
MPF)	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suf to make a determination of Evident or Confined	ficient				Potential: X Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
10000		Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil			Little or no potential for recepto contaminated soil	ers to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil					Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					

Surface Water Human CONTAMINANT Maximum Conc. Standard HAZARD Contaminant ug/L ug/L Ratio (2) FACTOR (1) Arsenic (cancer endpoint) 47.4 0.0 (CHF) Phenol 27.0 21,900.0 0.000 (Place an "X" next to one below) Mercury and compounds (inorganic) 2.91 11.0 0.260 Zinc 4.890.0 10,950.0 0.450 Significant (If Total > 100): Nickel and compounds 775.0 730.0 1.060 Cadmium and compounds 46.6 18.3 2.550 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Chromium (total) 517.0 182.5 2.830 62.8 Antimony and compounds 14.6 4.300 Minimal (If Total < 2): Beryllium and compounds 26.3 1.6 16.440 Lead 293.0 4.0 73.250 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only Total: 101.142 (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. MIGRATION Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that Evident -Confined - Information indicates a low potential for contamination (Place an "X" next to one below) PATHWAY contamination in the media is present at, is moving to a potential point of exposure (could by due to the FACTOR toward, or has moved to a point of exposure presence of geological structures or physical controls) Evident: (MPF) Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential -Potential: to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined Confined: Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) RECEPTOR Receptors identified that have access to surface water Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to Identified -FACTOR surface water Identified: (RF) Potential: Potential -Potential for receptors to have access to surface water Limited: Brief Rationale for Selection: Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS Site Name: SITE 00016 Surface Water Human Category: (High, Medium, Low)

			Surface Wate	r Eco Fresh		
ONTAMINANT		Contaminant	Maximum Conc.	Standard ug/L	Ratio (2)	
ACTOR (1)		Phenol	27.0	2,560.0	0.010	
CHF)		Arsenic (cancer endpoint)	47.4	190.0	0.250	(Place an "X" next to one below)
,1117)		Antimony and compounds	62.8	30.0	2.090	
		Nickel and compounds	775,0	160.0	4.840	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Beryllium and compounds	26.3	5.3	4.960	
		Cadmium and compounds	46,6	1.1	42.360	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		Zinc	4,890.0	110.0	44.450	
		Chromium (total)	517.0	11.0	47.000	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Lead	293.0	3.2	91.560	
		Mercury and compounds (inorganic)	2.91	0.012	242.500	
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		Total:	480.040	
IIGRATION ATHWAY ACTOR	Evident •	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is present at, is movi toward, or has moved to a point of exposure		offined - Information indicates a low potent to a potential point of exposure (of presence of geological structures of	could be due to the	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X
MPF)	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suffit to make a determination of Evident or Confined	nigrate cient			Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
ECEPTOR ACTOR RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surface	vater Li	mited - Little or no potential for receptors surface water	to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: X Potential:
	Potential •	Potential for receptors to have access to surface	water			Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
,						
Activity Name	YORKTOWN	I VA NWS	Site Name: SITE 00	016 Sur	face Water Fresh Category: (High, Medium, Low)	High

			Surface \	Water Eco Marine				
CONTAMINAN HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	?T	Contaminant Benzo[a]pyrene Chrysene Pyrene Anthracene Fluoranthene Benz[a]anthracene Phenanthrene Copper and compounds Arsenic (cancer endpoint) Chromium (total) (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg 0.05 0.075 0.081 0.021 0.19 0.074 0.077 8.3 6.5	Standard mg/Kg 400.0 400.0 350.0 85.0 600.0 230.0 225.0 70.0 33.0 80.0	Ratio (2) 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.120 0.220 Total: 3.599	(Place an "X" n Significant (If Moderate (If To	Γotal 2 - 100):	X
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	(2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standa Note: Only top ten contaminants are display Analytical data or observable evidence indic contamination in the media is present at, is r toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at to a point of exposure; or information is not to make a determination of Evident or Confi	ed. cates that moving t or migrate sufficient	potential point of exp	s a low potential for contamination posure (could be due to the presences or or physical controls)	•	next to one below)	
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:						
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to sedi	iment	Limited • Little or no potential	for receptors to have access to sed	iment Identified:	next to one below)	
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to sedi	iment			Potential: Limited:	X	
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:						
Activity Name	e: <u>YORKTOW</u> N	VA NWS	Site Name: <u>Sr</u>	TE 00016	Sediment Marine	Category: Med		

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/4/96					
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SOIL					
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00017	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):					
RMIS Site Type: LANDFILL	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes					
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High					
	SITE SUMMARY					
(Include only key elements of information use	ed to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)					
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	n, and other relevant information):					
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):						
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

	····			Ground Wate	er		
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)		Contaminant ug/L		onc.	Standard ug/L 0.0 10,950.0 11.0 730.0 1.6 36,500.0 182.5	Ratio (2) 0.020 0.030 0.480 3.630 4.490 5.040	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standar Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed	d		Total:	30.044	Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR MPF)	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indica contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in the contamination in the media is moving away from the contamination in		Confined	Information indicates that the pote contaminant migration from the so geological structures or physical co	ource is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X
WPF)	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at to a point of exposure; or information is not st to make a determination of Evident or Confin	ıfficient				Potential:
	Brief Rationale	for Selection:					
ECEPTOR ACTOR RF)	Identified •	There is a threatened or potentially threatened downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. cdrinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I of	r not) is a current	Limited	- There is no potentially threatened the source. The groundwater is no DW or is of limited benificial use (t considered a potential source of	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X
	Potential -	There is no potentially threatened water suppl of the source. The groundwater is potentially irrigation or agriculture, but not presently use	usable for DW,				Limited:
	Brief Rationale	for Selection:					
ctivity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name:	SITE 00017		Groundwater Category:	High

			Se	ili		
CONTAMINANT IAZARD		Contaminant	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
ACTOR (1)		Fluoranthene	1.8	2,600.0	0.000	
CHF)		Zinc	26.9	23,000.0	0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below)
·		Pyrene	3,9	2,000.0	0.000	_
		Mercury and compounds (inorganic)	0.08	23.0	0,000	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Benzo[k]fluoranthene	2.8	610.0	0.000	
		Benz[a]anthracene	2.5	61.0	0,040	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		Indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene	2.7	61.0	0.040	
		Benzo[b]fluoranthene	3.0	61.0	0.050	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Chrysene	2.6	24.0	0.110	_
		Arsenic (cancer endpoint)	2.8	22,0	0.130	
		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 		Total:	1.550	
IIGRATION ATHWAY ACTOR MPF)	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination is present at, is moving towards, moved to a point of exposure		nfined - Low possibility for contamination to or migrate to a point of exposure	o be present at	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident:
	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suf to make a determination of Evident or Confined	ficient			Potential: X Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:				
RECEPTOR FACTOR RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil	L	imited - Little or no potential for receptors to contaminated soil	b have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified:
,	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Potential: X Limited:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:				
Activity Name	YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: SITE Of	0017	Soil Categ	

Trestallation/Site Name for FUIDS VODVTOWN VA NIWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/4/96
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SWH SWEF SEDEM
Location (State): VA Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00018	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):
	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes
RMIS Site Type: DRAINAGE DITCH	
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High
	SITE SUMMARY
(Include only key elements of information use	ed to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	, and other relevant information):
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):	
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):	

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Ground Water			
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (I) (CHF)	•	Contaminant Nickel and compounds Zinc Mercury and compounds (inorganic) Barium and compounds Cadmium and compounds Chromium (total) Aluminum Beryllium and compounds Lead (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standai	Maximum Co ug/L 23.2 357.0 0.73 505.0 12.6 294.0 144,000.0 7.5 260.0		Standard ug/L 730.0 10,950.0 11.0 2,555.0 18.3 182.5 36,500.0 1.6 4.0 Total:	Ratio (2) 0.030 0.030 0.070 0.200 0.690 1.610 3.950 4.690 65.000	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential • Brief Rationale	Note: Only top ten contaminants are displaye Analytical data or observable evidence indica contamination in the media is moving away f Possibility for contamination to be present at to a point of exposure; or information is not s to make a determination of Evident or Confire for Selection:	ates that rom the source. or migrate ufficient	Confined -	Information indicates that the pot contaminant migration from the s geological structures or physical	ource is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified • Potential •	There is a threatened or potentially threatened downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I There is no potentially threatened water supp of the source. The groundwater is potentially irrigation or agriculture, but not presently use for Selection:	or not) is a current or IIA aquifer). ly well downgradient y usable for DW,	Limited -		i water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of e (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited:
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name:	SITE 00018		Groundwater Category:	High

			Surface Wa	ter Human		
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) CHF)	r	Contaminant Arsenic (cancer endpoint) Zinc Copper and compounds (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.	Maximum Conc, ug/L 4,1 369.0 199.0	Standard ug/L. 0.0 10,950.0 1,355.7 Total:	0.030 0.150	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
IIGRATION ATHWAY ACTOR MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination in the media is present at, is most toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suft to make a determination of Evident or Confined	ring migrate ficient	nfined - Information indicates a low poter to a potential point of exposure (o presence of geological structures	could by due to the	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
RECEPTOR PACTOR RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surface	water Li	imited - Little or no potential for receptor surface water	s to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to surface	water			Potential: X Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
Lctivity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: SITE 00	0 <u>18</u> Surfa	ice Water Human Category:	Low

			Surface	Water Eco Fr	esh		
CONTAMINAN HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	т	Contaminant Arsenic (cancer endpoint) Zinc Copper and compounds (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only	Maximum Conc ug/L 4.1 369.0 199.0		Standard ug/L 190.0 110.0 12.0 Total:	Ratio (2) 0.020 3.350 16.580	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	(2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is present at, is mov toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suff to make a determination of Evident or Confined e for Selection:	ing migrate ficient	to	formation indicates a low poter a potential point of exposure (esence of geological structures	(could be due to the	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surface Potential for receptors to have access to surface			ittle or no potential for receptor rface water	s to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: X Potential: Limited:
·	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
Activity Name	YORKTOWN	I VA NWS	Site Name: S	TE 00018	Sur	face Water Fresh Category	: <u>High</u>

Surface Water Eco Marine Standard Maximum Conc. CONTAMINANT Ratio (2) Contaminant mg/Kg mg/Kg HAZARD 1.9 33.0 0.060 FACTOR (1) Arsenic (cancer endpoint) (Place an "X" next to one below) 0.180 5.3 30.0 (CHF) Nickel and compounds 18.0 80.0 0.220 Chromium (total) 35.0 0.240 Significant (If Total > 100): 8.3 Lead 0.370 44.0 120.0 Zinc 70.0 0.410 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): 29.0 Copper and compounds 6.400 2.0 12.8 Antimony and compounds Minimal (If Total < 2): 7.877 Total: (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. (Place an "X" next to one below) Confined - Information indicates a low potential for contamination to a Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that MIGRATION Evident potential point of exposure (could be due to the presence contamination in the media is present at, is moving PATHWAY Evident: of geological structures or or physical controls) toward, or has moved to a point of exposure FACTOR (MPF) Potential: Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient Confined: to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to sediment Receptors identified that have access to sediment RECEPTOR Identified -Identified: FACTOR (RF) Potential: Potential for receptors to have access to sediment Potential -Limited: Brief Rationale for Selection: Sediment Marine Category: Med Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS Site Name: SITE 00018 (High, Medium, Low)

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 6/6/95
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SEDEM SOIL
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00019	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):
RMIS Site Type: CONTAMINATED GROUND WATER	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):	SITE SUMMARY d to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.) and other relevant information):
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):	

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

1

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Ground Water	er		
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	T	Contaminant Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6- Aluminum Cadmium and compounds Trinitrobenzene, 1,3,5- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.	Maximum Conc. ug/L 5.1 4,510.0 4.5 1.3	Standard ug/L 220.0 36,500.0 18.3 1.8 Total:	Ratio (2) 0.020 0.120 0.250 0.720	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is moving away from Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suffit to make a determination of Evident or Confined	n the source. migrate icient	Information indicates that the pote contaminant migration from the so geological structures or physical co	urce is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified - Potential -	There is a threatened or potentially threatened water supply downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. or not) is a current drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I or IIA aquifer). There is no potentially threatened water supply well downgradient of the source. The groundwater is potentially usable for DW, irrigation or agriculture, but not presently used (Class IIB aquifer).		- There is no potentially threatened the source. The groundwater is no DW or is of limited benificial use (t considered a potential source of	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited: X
Activity Name	e: <u>YORKTOWN</u>	VA NWS	Site Name: SITE 00019		Groundwater Category:	Low

Soil Standard CONTAMINANT Maximum Conc. Ratio (2) mg/Kg mg/Kg HAZARD Contaminant 0.000 6,500.0 0.77 FACTOR (1) Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-23,000.0 0.000 (Place an "X" next to one below) Zinc 69.1 (CHF) 0.010 14,9 2,800.0 Copper and compounds 0.010 Significant (If Total > 100): 1.3 130.0 Dinitrotoluene, 2,4-0.010 20.0 1,500.0 Nickel and compounds 0.030 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): 4,800.0 120.0 Trinitrotoluene, 2,4,6-0.080 28.7 380.0 Chromium (total) 0.090 Minimal (If Total < 2): 49.1 540.0 Vanadium 0.120 49.9 400.0 Lead 2.6 14.0 0.190 Beryllium and compounds Total: 3,305 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. (Place an "X" next to one below) Confined - Low possibility for contamination to be present at Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that MIGRATION Evident or migrate to a point of exposure contamination is present at, is moving towards, or has PATHWAY Evident: moved to a point of exposure FACTOR (MPF) Potential: Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient Confined: to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to Receptors identified that have access to RECEPTOR Identified contaminated soil Identified: contaminated soil FACTOR (RF) Potential: Potential -Potential for receptors to have access to Limited: contaminated soil Brief Rationale for Selection: Soil Category: Site Name: SITE 00019 Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS (High, Medium, Low)

	- 		Surfa	ce Water Eco Mi	arine			
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	r	Contaminant Benzo[a]pyrene Anthracene Fluorene Benz[a]anthracene Dibenz[ah]anthracene Chrysene Pyrene Fluoranthene Phenanthrene Zine	Maximum Co mg/Kg 1.2 0.4 0.23 1.6 0.46 8.2 13.0 27.0 26.0	onc.	Standard mg/Kg 400.0 85.0 35.0 230.0 60.0 400.0 350.0 600.0 225.0	Ratio (2) 0,000 0,000 0,010 0,010 0,010 0,010 0,020 0,040 0,050 0,120 1,040	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):	X
		Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.			Total	1.289		
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -				Information indicates a low po potential point of exposure (co of geological structures or or p	uld be due to the presence	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:	•
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:						
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Limited •	Little or no potential for recep	tors to have access to sediment	(Place an "X" next to one below Identified: Potential: X	-	
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to sedime	ent				Limited:	_
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:						
Activity Nam	e: <u>YORKTOWN</u>	I VA NWS	Site Name:	SITE 00019		Sediment Marine Category:	: <u>M</u> ed	_

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year):					
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SOIL					
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00021	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):					
RMIS Site Type: SURFACE DISPOSAL AREA	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes	,				
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High					
	SITE SUMMARY					
(Include only key elements of information use	ed to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)					
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	, and other relevant information):					
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):						
, , ,						
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Ground Wate	r		
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD FACTOR (1) CHF)	т	Contaminant Arsenic (cancer endpoint) Mercury and compounds (inorganic) Nickel and compounds Barium and compounds Nitrate Chromium (total) Aluminum Cadmium and compounds Beryllium and compounds Lead	Maximum C ug/L 5.8 0.25 117.0 412.0 25,100.0 244.0 80,300.0 145.0 18.1		Standard ug/L 0.0 11.0 730.0 2,555.0 58,400.0 182.5 36,500.0 18.3 1.6 4.0	Ratio (2) 0.020 0.160 0.160 0.430 1.340 2.200 7.920 11.310 20.750	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100):X Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	contamination in the media is moving away from the source.		Total: Information indicates that the pote contaminant migration from the s geological structures or physical of	ource is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident:	
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:	•				
RECEPTOR FACTOR RF)	CTOR downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. or not) is a current		Limited ·	1 - There is no potentially threatened water supply well downgradient of the source. The groundwater is not considered a potential source of DW or is of limited benificial use (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).		(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited: X	
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
Activity Name	e: <u>YORKTOWN</u>	VA NWS	Site Name:	SITE 00021		Groundwater Category:	Med

the state of the s

				Soil		
ONTAMINANT			Maximum Conc.	Standard		
IAZARD		Contaminant	mg/Kg	mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
ACTOR (1)		Xylene (mixed)	0.004	980.0	0.000	
CHF)		Trichloroethane, 1,1,1-	0.014	1,900.0	0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below)
,		Styrene	0.02	2,200.0	0.000	
		Toluene	0.035	870.0	0.000	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Pyrene	0.98	2,000.0	0.000	
		Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP)	2.1	3,200.0	0.000	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		Benzo[k]fluoranthene	0.54	610.0	0.000	
		Pentachlorophenol	0.29	250.0	0.000	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Nickel and compounds	9.2	1,500.0	0.010	
		Barium and compounds	72.8	5,300.0	0.010	
		 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 		Total:	2.277	
AIGRATION ATHWAY ACTOR MPF)	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that contamination is present at, is moving towards, or has or migrate to a point of exposure Confined - Low possibility for contamination to be present or migrate to a point of exposure				(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident:
,	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined				Potential: X Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:				
RECEPTOR FACTOR RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil		Limited - Little or no potential for receptor contaminated soil	s to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: X Potential:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
		VA NWS	Site Name: SITE	; 00021	Soil Categ	ory: High

1.1

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 6/5/95
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): SWH SWEM
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SITE 00022	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):
RMIS Site Type: BURN AREA	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High
(Include only key elements of information used Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	SITE SUMMARY d to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.) , and other relevant information):
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil): SURFACE WATER	
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological): ECOLOGICAL AND HUMAN	

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Surface Wat	er Human		
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1)	,	Contaminant Mercury and compounds (inorganic) Cadmium and compounds	Maximum Conc. ug/L 5.56 11.6	Standard ug/L 11.0 18.3	Ratio (2) 0.510 0.630	(Place an "X" next to one below)
СНҒ)		Beryllium and compounds Antimony and compounds Lead	2.2 44.1 215.0	1.6 14.6 4.0	1.380 3.020 53.750	Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		Total:	59.285	Minimai (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY PACTOR MPF)	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is present at, is movi toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or	ng migrate	fined - Information indicates a low poter to a potential point of exposure (of presence of geological structures	could by due to the	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X
	Brief Rational	to a point of exposure; or information is not suff- to make a determination of Evident or Confined e for Selection:	(Cicili			Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surface	water Li	nited - Little or no potential for receptor surface water	s to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to surface	water			Limited: X
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	I VA NWS	Site Name: SITE 00	922 Surfa	ace Water Human Category:	: <u>L</u> ow

	············		Surface Wate	r Eco Marine		
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) CHF)	Г	Contaminant Antimony and compounds Lead Nickel and compounds Zinc (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only	Maximum Conc. ug/L 43.1 32.5 33.6 1,200.0	Standard ug/L 500.0 8.5 8.3 86.0	Ratio (2) 0.090 3.820 4.050 13.950	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100); Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY PACTOR MPF)	Evident - Potential -	(2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Analytical data or observable evidence indicates the contamination in the media is present at, is moving toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or m to a point of exposure; or information is not suffice to make a determination of Evident or Confined	grate	nfined - Information indicates a low pote to a potential point of exposure presence of geological structure	(could be due to the	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
ECEPTOR ACTOR RF)	Brief Rational Identified - Potential -	e for Selection: Receptors identified that have access to surface we expected the surface we have access to surface we ha		imited - Little or no potential for recepto surface water	ors to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: <u>SITE 00</u>	0022 Suri	face Water Marine Catego	

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS Location (State): VA Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00001 (5 / TE 23) RMIS Site Type: SURFACE DISPOSAL AREA Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 10/10/95 Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SWH SWEM SEDH SEDEM SOIL Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage): Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High						
Tont of Contact (Name/Thone).	SITE SUMMARY						
	(Include only key elements of information used to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.) Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation, and other relevant information):						
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):							
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):							

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Ground Water			
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) CHF)	r	Contaminant Thallium 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene Cadmium and compounds RDX (Cyclonite) Barium and compounds Vanadium Dinitrotoluene mixture Aluminum Manganese and compounds (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Stand		nc.	Standard ug/L 0.0 220.0 18.3 61.0 2,555.0 255.5 9.9 36,500.0 182.5	Ratio (2) 0.000 0.020 0.150 0.250 0.320 0.710 0.950 2.090 23.840	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential - Brief Rational	contamination in the media is moving away from the source.		Confined -	Information indicates that the po contaminant migration from the geological structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified - Potential -	There is a threatened or potentially threaten downgradient of the source. The GW (cont drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class There is no potentially threatened water sup of the source. The groundwater is potential irrigation or agriculture, but not presently use for Selection:	or not) is a current for IIA aquifer). ply well downgradient ly usable for DW,	Limited -		d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of e (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited:
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWŞ	Site Name:	SWMU 00001	(sire 23)	Groundwater Category (High, Medium, Low)	: <u>High</u>

4:

			Soil			
			3011	•		
CONTAMINANT IAZARD	•	Contonia	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
ACTOR (1)		Contaminant Dieldrin	0.087	2.8	0.030	_
CHF)		Beryllium and compounds	0.835	14.0	0.060	(Place an "X" next to one below)
···· ,		Benzo[k]fluoranthene	39.0	610.0	0.060	
		Aluminum	12,300.0	77,000.0	0.160	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Cadmium and compounds	6.65	38.0	0.170	
		1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene	1.1	3.3	0.330	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		Benz(a)anthracene	27.0	61.0	0.440	
		Benzo[b]fluoranthene	49.0	61.0	0.800	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Manganese and compounds	347.0	380.0	0.910	
		Lead	447.0	400.0	1.120	
		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 		Total:	20.500	
IIGRATION ATHWAY ACTOR MPF)	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination is present at, is moving towards, moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential:			
	Totelliai -	to a point of exposure; or information is not suf to make a determination of Evident or Confined	Confined:			
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
ECEPTOR ACTOR RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil	Lim	nited - Little or no potential for receptors to contaminated soil	have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Potential: X Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
ctivity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: SWMU (X	0001 (sire 23)	Soil Categ	

Surface Water Human Standard Maximum Conc. CONTAMINANT Ratio (2) ug/L ug/L HAZARD Contaminant 0.000 39,500.0 0.0 FACTOR (1) 0.030 (Place an "X" next to one below) 11.0 Mercury and compounds (inorganic) 0.31 (CHF) 57.5 1.355.7 0.040 Copper and compounds 0.050 Significant (If Total > 100): 551.0 10,950.0 0.130 2.4 18.3 Cadmium and compounds Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): 182.5 0.140 25.6 Chromium VI and compounds 28.000 112.0 4.0 Lead Minimal (If Total < 2): 28.392 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only Total: (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. (Place an "X" next to one below) Confined - Information indicates a low potential for contamination Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that MIGRATION Evident • to a potential point of exposure (could by due to the contamination in the media is present at, is moving PATHWAY presence of geological structures or physical controls) Evident: FACTOR toward, or has moved to a point of exposure (MPF) Potential: Potential -Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient Confined: to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to Receptors identified that have access to surface water RECEPTOR Identified -Identified: surface water FACTOR (RF) Potential: Potential for receptors to have access to surface water Potential -Limited: Brief Rationale for Selection: SWMU 00001 (SITE 23) Surface Water Human Category: High Site Name: Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS (High, Medium, Low)

			Surface Water Ec	o Marine			
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1)	r	Contaminant Mercury and compounds (inorganic)	Maximum Conc. ug/L 0.31	Standard ug/L 0.0	Ratio (2) 0.000		
CHF)		Iron	39,500.0	0.0	0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below)	
JIIF)		Copper and compounds	57.5	0.0	0.000	(Flace all X liext to one below)	
		Cadmium and compounds	2.4	9.3	0.260	Significant (If Total > 100):	
		Chromium VI and compounds	25.6	50.0	0.510	Significant (it Total > 100):	
			551.0	86.0	6.410	M. J (76 T-4-1 2 - 100).	
		Zinc	112.0	8.5	13.180	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):	
		Lead	112.0	8.3	13.180	Minimal (If Total < 2):	
						Minima (II Total C2).	
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only		Total:	20.354		
		(2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		L			
IGRATION ATHWAY	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is present at, is moving		 d - Information indicates a low potenti to a potential point of exposure (co 	ould be due to the	(Place an "X" next to one below)	
ACTOR APF)		toward, or has moved to a point of exposure		presence of geological structures or physical controls)			
,	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or r to a point of exposure; or information is not suffi				Potential:	
		to make a determination of Evident or Confined				Confined:	
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
			•				
		D	T !!4-	d - Little or no potential for receptors	to have aggers to	(Place an "X" next to one below)	
ECEPTOR	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surface v	vater Limite	surface water	to have access to	Identified:	
ACTOR RF)				sanaco water			
(F)						Potential: X	
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to surface v	vater				
						Limited:	
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
						, .	
ctivity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: SWMU 0000	<u> (ς : τε 23)</u> Surfac	e Water Marine Category:	High	

			Sedime	nt Human		***************************************
CONTAMINAN HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	ľΤ	Contaminant DDT Benzo[b]fluoranthene Mercury and compounds (inorganic)	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg 0,0017 0.27 0.3	Standard mg/Kg 130.0 61.0 23.0	Ratio (2) 0.000 0.000 0.010	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		Tots	l: 1.75E-02	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident • Potential •	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates th contamination in the media is present at, is moving toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or mi to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficit to make a determination of Evident or Confined	grate	Confined - Information indicates a low potential point of exposure (c of geological structures or or	ould be due to the presence	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationals	c for Selection:				
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to sediment		Limited - Little or no potential for rece	otors to have access to sediment	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to sediment				Potential: X Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
Activity Nam	e: <u>YORKTOWN</u>	VA NWS S	ite Name: <u>SWM</u>	U 0000 (s17ε 23)	Sediment Human Category:	Med

			Surface Wate	r Eco Marine		
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) CHF)	r	Contaminant Mercury and compounds (inorganic) Benzo[h]fluoranthene DDT	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg 0.3 0.27 0.0017	Standard mg/Kg 0.0 0.0 2.0	Ratio (2) 0.000 0.000 0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		Total	0.001	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates t contamination in the media is present at, is movin toward, or has moved to a point of exposure		nfined - Information indicates a low po potential point of exposure (co of geological structures or or p	uld be due to the presence	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X
,	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or m to a point of exposure; or information is not suffic to make a determination of Evident or Confined	igrate ient			Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
RECEPTOR ACTOR RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to sediment	L	imited - Little or no potential for recept	ors to have access to sediment	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X
	Potential •	Potential for receptors to have access to sediment				Potential: X Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: <u>SWMU</u>	0000] (SITE 23)	Sediment Marine Category:	Med

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year)	: 10/10/95			
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sedi				
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00002	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv,				
RMIS Site Type: BURN AREA	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a				
	National Priority List (Y/N):	·	Site Rank:		
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Friority List (1714):	NO	Site Rank:	riigii	*****
	SITE SUMMARY			•	
(Include only key elements of information use	ed to conduct the relative risk site evalua	ation. Attach map viev	v of site if desired.)		
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	n, and other relevant information):				
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):					
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):					

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Ground Water			
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD FACTOR (I) (CHF)	r	Contaminant RDX (Cyclonite) Acetone Manganese and compounds (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only	Maximum (ug/L 7.9 600.0 576.0	Conc.	Standard ug/L 61.0 610.0 182.5	Ratio (2) 0.130 0.980 3.160	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100); Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential •	(2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is moving away from Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suffit to make a determination of Evident or Confined	n the source.	Confined -	Information indicates that the po- contaminant migration from the geological structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Scle ction:					
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	There is a threatened or potentially threatened we downgradient of the source. The GW (cont, or not drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I or I There is no potentially threatened water supply of the source. The groundwater is potentially usignification or agriculture, but not presently used (to the source).	ot) is a current IA aquifer). well downgradient able for DW,	Limited -	There is no potentially threatened the source. The groundwater is a DW or is of limited benificial use	d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of c (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name:	SWMU 00002		Groundwater Category: (High, Medium, Low)	<u>High</u>

				Soil		
CONTAMINANT IAZARD	r	Contaminant	Maximum Conc.	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
ACTOR (1)		Beryllium and compounds	0,31	14.0	0.020	
CHF)		Antimony and compounds	3.3	31.0	0.110	(Place an "X" next to one below)
J. 111)		Arsenic (cancer)	5.5	32.0	0.170	
		Aluminum	14,500.0	77,000.0	0.190	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Manganese and compounds	210.0	380.0	0.550	
						Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
						Minimal (If Total < 2):
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		Total:	1.041	
PATHWAY FACTOR MPF) Potential	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suf to make a determination of Evident or Confine	ficient			Potential:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
RECEPTOR I FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil	·	Limited - Little or no potential for receptor contaminated soil	s to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below Identified: Potential; X
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Limited:
	Brief Rational	le for Selection:				

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 8/10/95						
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW						
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00003	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):						
RMIS Site Type: FIRE/CRASH TRAINING AREA	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes						
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High						
	SITE SUMMARY						
(Include only key elements of information used	d to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)						
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	, and other relevant information):						
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):							
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):							

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Ground Water			
CONTAMINANT	Т		Maximum C	Conc.	Standard	Posto (2)	
IAZARD		Contaminant	ug/L 258.0		ug/L 36,500.0	Ratio (2) 0.010	
ACTOR (1)		Aluminum Trichloroethylene (TCE)	1.7		160.0	0.010	(Place an "X" next to one below)
CHF)		Selenium	2.2		182.5	0.010	(trace are in the next to one colors)
		Bis(2-cthylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP)	7.0		480.0	0.010	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Barium and compounds	39.3		2,555.0	0.020	Digitite (ii Total 7 200)
		Dichloroethylene, 1,2- (cis)	1.0		61.0	0.020	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): X
		Acetone	12.0		610,0	0.020	
		Methylene chloride	9.0		430.0	0.020	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Chloromethane	3.2	·····	150.0	0.020	
		Antimony and compounds	41.9		14.6	2.870	
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standar Note: Only top ten contaminants are displaye	rd		Total:	3.008	
MIGRATION PATHWAY PACTOR MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indica contamination in the media is moving away for Possibility for contamination to be present at	rom the source.	Confined -	Information indicates that the p contaminant migration from the geological structures or physica	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X
	Brief Rational	to a point of exposure; or information is not s to make a determination of Evident or Confin e for Selection:					Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR RF)	Identified -	There is a threatened or potentially threatened downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I	or not) is a current	Limited •	the source. The groundwater is	ed water supply well downgradient of mot considered a potential source of se (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: X Potential:
	Potential -	There is no potentially threatened water supp of the source. The groundwater is potentially irrigation or agriculture, but not presently use	usable for DW,				Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
Activity Name	e: <u>YORKTOWN</u>	VA NWS	Site Name:	SWMU 00003		Groundwater Category: (High, Medium, Low)	High

TO A STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year)	. 10/18/05		
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sedin			
Location (State): VA Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00004	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv,			
	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a			
RMIS Site Type: SURFACE DISPOSAL AREA				Med
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank:	Med
	SITE SUMMARY			
(Include only key elements of information use	ed to conduct the relative risk site evalua	ation. Attach map view	of site if desired.)	
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	a, and other relevant information):			
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):				
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):				

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

			Soil			
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	,	Contaminant DDT Pyrene Fluoranthene Silver and compounds Benzo[k]fluoranthene Mercury and compounds (inorganic) Indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene Zinc Dibenz[ah]anthracene Benzo[b]fluoranthene (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard		Standard mg/Kg 130.0 2,000.0 2,600.0 380.0 610.0 23.0 61.0 23,000.0 6.1 61.0 Total:	Ratio (2) 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.010 0.010 0.010 0.020 0.030 3.034	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination is present at, is moving towards, moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suit to make a determination of Evident or Confine	es that Confin or has r migrate fficient	ned • Low possibility for contamination to or migrate to a point of exposure	b be present at	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Brief Rational Identified -	e for Selection: Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil	Limi	ited - Little or no potential for receptors to contaminated soil	o have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential:
	Potential - Brief Rational	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Limited:
Activity Name			Site Name: SWMU 00	0004	Soil Category:	<u>Mcd</u>

·				
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year	r): <u>3/18/96</u>		
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sedi	iment, Soil): <u>GW</u>	SOIL	
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00005	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remy	v, RD/RA, or equiv.	RCRA Stage):	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
RMIS Site Type: SURFACE DISPOSAL AREA	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a	agreement e.g., FFA	, Permit, Order) Yes	
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank:L	ow
	SITE SUMMARY			
(Include only key elements of information use	d to conduct the relative risk site evalu	uation. Attach map vi	lew of site if desired.)	
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	, and other relevant information):			
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil): Surface Soil and Sediments.				
Surface 5011 and Sediments.				
			1	
			en e	
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):				
Mainly ecological receptors.				

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

			Gro	und Water			
CONTAMINAN HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	т	Contaminant (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.	Maximum Conc.		Standard ug/L Total:	0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates the contamination in the media is moving away from the Possibility for contamination to be present at or mit to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficite to make a determination of Evident or Confined the for Selection:	he source. Igrate		Information indicates that the po- contaminant migration from the e geological structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified • Potential •	There is a threatened or potentially threatened wat downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. or not drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I or II.4) There is no potentially threatened water supply we of the source. The groundwater is potentially usab irrigation or agriculture, but not presently used (Clast of Selection:	t) is a current A aquifer). Il downgradient ble for DW,	Limited -		d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of e (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited:
Activity Name	e: <u>YORKTOW</u> N	VA NWS S	Site Name: <u>SW</u>	MU 00005		Groundwater Category:	Low

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Soil			
CONTAMINAN IIAZARD FACTOR (I) (CHF)	Т	Contaminant	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	(Place an "X" next to one below)
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		Total:	0.983	Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate: contamination is present at, is moving towards, moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suff to make a determination of Evident or Confined	or has migrate ïcient	Low possibility for contaminatio or migrate to a point of exposure	n to be present at	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Brief Rationale	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil	Limited	- Little or no potential for receptor contaminated soil	rs to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X
	Potential - Brief Rational	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil e for Selection:				Limited:
Activity Name	e: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: SWMU 00005		Soil Category:	Low

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year):	10/10/95			
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sedin	nent, Soil): GW	SOIL		
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00006 (sire 24)	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv,	RD/RA, or equiv.	RCRA Stage):		
RMIS Site Type: LANDFILL	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of ag	reement e.g., FFA	, Permit, Order) Yes		·
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank:	High	
	SITE SUMMARY				
(Include only key elements of information used	d to conduct the relative risk site evaluat	tion. Attach map vi	iew of site if desired.)		
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	and other relevant information).				
27.01.01.0 December (American Site type) materials disposed oil and of operations	, and once role and mornially.				
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):					
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):					

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contaminatio (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Ground Water			
CONTAMINANT IAZARD ACTOR (I) CHF)	r	Contaminant Arsenic (cancer) Lead Manganese and compounds Beryllium and compounds Chromium VI and compounds Aluminum Vanadium Cadmium and compounds 1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC) Nickel and compounds (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standa	Maximum Coug/L 436.0 113.0 1,690.0 7.8 500.0 98,800.0 603.0 27.1 10.0 237.0		Standard ug/L 3.8 4.0 182.5 1.6 180.0 37,000.0 260.0 18.0 12.0 730.0	Ratio (2) 114.740 28.250 9.260 4.880 2.740 2.710 2.360 1.480 0.830 0.320	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY PACTOR MPF)	Evident - Potential - Brief Rationale	Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed Analytical data or observable evidence indict contamination in the media is moving away to a point of exposure; or information is not to make a determination of Evident or Confine for Selection:	ates that from the source. t or migrate sufficient	Confined •	Information indicates that the po contaminant migration from the geological structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified • Potential • Brief Rational	There is a threatened or potentially threatene downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I There is no potentially threatened water suppof the source. The groundwater is potentially irrigation or agriculture, but not presently use for Selection:	or not) is a current or IIA aquifer). ply well downgradient y usable for DW,	Limited -	There is no potentially threatene the source. The groundwater is a DW or is of limited benificial use	d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of e (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited:
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	I VA NWS	Site Name:	SWMU 00006	(SITE 24)	Groundwater Category:	High

			Soil			
ONTAMINANT			Maximum Conc.	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
AZARD		Contaminant	mg/Kg	4.9	0.860	
ACTOR (1)		Arochlor 1016	4,2	380.0	0.580	(Place an "X" next to one below)
HF)		Manganese and compounds	11.9	31.0	0.380	·
		Antimony and compounds Mercury and compounds (inorganic)	4.7	23,0	0.200	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Aluminum	12,600,0	77,000.0	0.160	
		Cadmium and compounds	4.3	38.0	0.110	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		Arsenic (cancer)	3.0	32.0	0.090	
		Dieldrin	0.079	2.8_	0.030	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Beryllium and compounds	0.36	14,0	0.030	
		Benzo[a]pyrene	0.15	6.1	0.020	
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed	1	Total:	2.476	
PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)		moved to a point of exposure	s, or has			Evident: X
	Potential -	moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at c to a point of exposure; or information is not su to make a determination of Evident or Confine	or migrate officient			Potential: Confined:
		Possibility for contamination to be present at c to a point of exposure; or information is not su	or migrate officient			Potential:
		Possibility for contamination to be present at composition to a point of exposure; or information is not sut to make a determination of Evident or Confine	or migrate ifficient ed	ited - Little or no potential for receptors to contaminated soil	have access to	Potential:
MPF) RECEPTOR PACTOR	Brief Rational	Possibility for contamination to be present at c to a point of exposure; or information is not su to make a determination of Evident or Confine for Selection: Receptors identified that have access to	or migrate ifficient ed		have access to	Potential: Confined: (Place an "X" next to one below) Identified:
APF) ECEPTOR ACTOR	Brief Rational Identified • Potential •	Possibility for contamination to be present at composition to a point of exposure; or information is not sum to make a determination of Evident or Confine for Selection: Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil Potential for receptors to have access to	or migrate ifficient ed		have access to	Potential: Confined: (Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 10/10/95 Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SWEF SEDH SEDEF SEDEM SOIL					
Location (State): VA						
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00007 (SITE 25)	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remy	, RD/RA, or equiv.	RCRA Stage):			
RMIS Site Type: UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a	ngreement e.g., FFA	, Permit, Order) Yes			
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank:	High		
	SITE SUMMARY	,				
(Include only key elements of information used	d to conduct the relative risk site evalu	ation. Attach map v	iew of site if desired.)			
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	, and other relevant information):					
			4			
			:			
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):						
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)		Contaminant	Maximum Conc.		Standard		
FACTOR (1)	Manganese and co	Contaminant		ı	ug/L	Ratio (2)	
		Manganese and compounds 3,950.0		182.5		21.640	
(CHF)		ompounds	206,000.0		37,000.0	5.640	(Place an "X" next to one bel-
	Vanadium		1,100.0		260.0	4.310	
	Antimony and con	mnounde	53.4		15.0	3.660	Significant (If Total > 100):
	Dichloroethylene,		120.0		55.0	2.180	
) — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —	trinitro-1,3,5-triazine	48.0		61.0	0.790	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
ł	Trichloroethane, 1		700.0		1,300.0	0,540	
	Nickel and compo		391.0		730.0	0.540	Minimal (If Total < 2):
	Barium and compo		972.0		2,600.0	0.380	
	Copper and compo		182.0		1,400.0	0.130	
	(1) Evaluate for h (2) Ratio = Maxin	human contaminants only imum Concentration/Standard in contaminants are displayed.			Total:	40.322	
PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Potential - Possibility for conto a point of expo	r observable evidence indicates the media is moving away from ntamination to be present at or osure; or information is not sufficient tination of Evident or Confined	m the source. r migrate fficient	contam	ation indicates that the p inant migration from the ical structures or physica	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one bel Evident: X Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationale for Selection:						
FACTOR	downgradient of t	ened or potentially threatened v the source. The GW (cont. or ource or is equiv. to (Class I or	not) is a current	the sou	irce. The groundwater is	ed water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of se (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one be
(RF)	Potential - There is no potential of the source. Th	ntially threatened water supply the groundwater is potentially u culture, but not presently used	well downgradient usable for DW,				Potential: X Limited:
	Brief Rationale for Selection:						

en de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la c

······································			Soil			
CONTAMINANT IAZARD 'ACTOR (1) CHF)		Contaminant Aluminum phosphide Manganese and compounds Calcium cyanide Arsenic (noncancer) Aluminum Arsenic (cancer) Vanadium Lead Chromium VI and compounds Benzo[a]pyrene (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg 8,270.0 328.0 578.0 2.7 8,270.0 2.7 25.8 16.2 11.0 0.17	Standard mg/Kg 31.0 380.0 3,100.0 22.0 77,000.0 32.0 540.0 400.0 3,000.0 6.1 Total:	Ratio (2) 266.770 0.860 0.190 0.120 0.110 0.080 0.050 0.040 0.030 0.030	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100):X Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY PACTOR MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination is present at, is moving towards, moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suf to make a determination of Evident or Confined	or has migrate ficient	ned - Low possibility for contamination to or migrate to a point of exposure	o be present at	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil Potential for receptors to have access to	Lim	ited - Little or no potential for receptors to contaminated soil	have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: SWMU 00	0007 (SITE 25)	Soil Category:	High

Surface Water Eco Fresh Maximum Conc. Standard CONTAMINANT Ratio (2) HAZARD Contaminant ug/L ug/L 0.200 FACTOR (1) Copper and compounds 2.4 12.0 61 110.0 0.060 (Place an "X" next to one below) (CHF) Zinc Beryllium and compounds 0.1 5.3 0.020 0.000 Vanadium sulfate 6.8 0.0 Significant (If Total > 100): 0.0 0.000 9.1 Manganese and compounds 0.000 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Barium and compounds 23.4 0.0 0.000 116.0 Aluminum Minimal (If Total < 2): 0.274 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only Total: (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Confined - Information indicates a low potential for contamination (Place an "X" next to one below) MIGRATION Evident -Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that to a potential point of exposure (could be due to the contamination in the media is present at, is moving PATHWAY presence of geological structures or physical controls) Evident: toward, or has moved to a point of exposure FACTOR (MPF) Potential: Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient Confined: to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to RECEPTOR Identified -Receptors identified that have access to surface water Identified: surface water FACTOR (RF) Potential: Potential for receptors to have access to surface water Potential -Limited: Brief Rationale for Selection: SWMU 00007 (SITE 25) Surface Water Fresh Category: Activity Name: YORKTOWN VA NWS Site Name: (High, Medium, Low)

			Sedim	ent Human			
CONTAMINAN HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	т	Contaminant Arsenic (noncancer) Nickel and compounds Benzo[k]fluoranthene	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg 17.1 21.9 0.34	Standar mg/Kj 22.0 1,500.0 610.0)	Ratio (2) 0.780 0.010 0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.			Total:	0.792	Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates t contamination in the media is present at, is movin toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or m to a point of exposure; or information is not suffic to make a determination of Evident or Confined	g	Confined - Information indicat potential point of e of geological struct	xposure (could l	be due to the presence	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					(Place an "X" next to one below)
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to sediment		Limited - Little or no potenti	al for receptors t	to have access to sediment	Identified: Potential: X
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to sediment					Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
Activity Name	e: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: <u>SWM</u>	1U 00007 (SITE 25)	S	ediment Human Category:	Med

Sediment Eco Fresh Standard Maximum Conc. CONTAMINANT Ratio (2) mg/Kg HAZARD Contaminant 120.0 1.140 137.0 FACTOR (1) Zinc 36.0 31.0 1.030 (Place an "X" next to one below) Lead (CHF) 0.820 0.82 Silver and compounds Significant (If Total > 100): 21.9 16.0 0.730 Nickel and compounds 0.520 17.1 33.0 Arsenic (noncancer) 2.6 0.510 Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): 40.5 Chromium VI and compounds 1.6 0.330 23.0 Copper and compounds 0.000 Minimal (If Total < 2): 0.49 0.47 Pyrene 0.32 0.000 Benz(a)anthracene 0.26 0.000 0.06 0.36 Chrysene Total: 5.078 (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Confined - Information indicates a low potential for contamination to a (Place an "X" next to one below) Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that MIGRATION Evident potential point of exposure (could be due to the presence contamination in the media is present at, is moving PATHWAY of geological structures or or physical controls) Evident: toward, or has moved to a point of exposure FACTOR (MPF) Potential: Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate Potential to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient Confined: to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection: (Place an "X" next to one below) Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to sediment Receptors identified that have access to sediment RECEPTOR Identified -Identified: FACTOR (RF) Potential: Potential for receptors to have access to sediment Potential -Limited: Brief Rationale for Selection: SWMU 00007 (SITE 25) Sediment Fresh Category: Site Name: Activity Name: YORKTOWN VANWS (High, Medium, Low)

CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)		Contaminant	Maximum Cor				
	(1) 1 (2) 1	cel and compounds enic (noncancer) zo[k]fluoranthene Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	mg/Kg 21.9 17.1 0.34	ic.	Standard mg/Kg 30.0 33.0	Ratio (2) 0.730 0.520 0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
	ient - Anal control towa	e: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. lytical data or observable evidence indicate amination in the media is present at, is morard, or has moved to a point of exposure sibility for contamination to be present at or point of exposure; or information is not subtake a determination of Evident or Confined election:	ring migrate ficient		Information indicates a low p potential point of exposure (c of geological structures or or		(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
FACTOR (RF)		eptors identified that have access to sedime		Limited -	Little or no potential for recep	otors to have access to sediment	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited:
Brief	f Rationale for Se	lection:		and the second s		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS Location (State): VA Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00008 RMIS Site Type: INDUSTRIAL DISCHARGE Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 9/10/96 Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): SOIL Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage): Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: Low				
(Include only low story at a finformation year	SITE SUMMARY I to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)				
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,					
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):					
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):					

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Soil			
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	г	Contaminant Arsenic (cancer) Lead Manganese and compounds Vanadium Benzo[a]pyrene Anthracin Beryllium and compounds Mercury Benzo(b)fluoranthene	Maximum 6 mg/Kg 49.0 356.0 305.0 88.6 0.35 0.76 0.48 0.46	Conc.	Standard mg/Kg 22.0 400.0 380.0 540.0 6.1 19.0 14.0 23.0 61.0	Ratio (2) 2,230 0,890 0,800 0,160 0,060 0,040 0,030 0,020 0,010	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2);
		Butyl benzyl phthalate (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.			13,000.0 Tota	0.000 al: 4.240	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination is present at, is moving towards moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not sur to make a determination of Evident or Confine	, or has r migrate fficient	Confined -	Low possibility for contaminor migrate to a point of expos		(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: Confined: X
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil		Limited •	Little or no potential for rece contaminated soil	ptors to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential:
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil					Limited: X
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name:	SWMU 00008		Soil Category: (High, Medium, Low)	Low

•						
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year	r): <u>11/14/95</u>				
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sed	iment, Soil): <u>GW</u>	/ SOIL			
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00009	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remy	, RD/RA, or equiv.	RCRA Stage):			
RMIS Site Type: LEACH FIELD	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a	agreement e.g., FFA	, Permit, Order) Yes			
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank:	Med		
	SITE SUMMARY				. •	
(Include only key elements of information use	ed to conduct the relative risk site evalu	ation. Attach map v	iew of site if desired.)			
					* *	
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	i, and other relevant information):				, we	
					1 Strange Street	
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):						
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

<u>,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</u>			<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	Ground Water	r		
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	r	Contaminant 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene RDX (Cyclonite) Arsenic (cancer) Lead 2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene 2,4-Dinitrophenol Cyanide (free) Beryllium and compounds Chromium VI and compounds Vanadium (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Stance	iard	Conc.	Standard ug/L 1.8 61.0 3.8 4.0 220.0 73.0 730.0 1.6 180.0 260.0	Ratio (2) 1.610 0.250 0.060 0.020 0.020 0.010 0.010 0.000 0.000 1.987	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential - Brief Rational	Note: Only top ten contaminants are display Analytical data or observable evidence indi contamination in the media is moving away Possibility for contamination to be present to a point of exposure; or information is no to make a determination of Evident or Cont e for Selection:	cates that of rom the source. at or migrate t sufficient	Confined -	Information indicates that the po- contaminant migration from the geological structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified - Potential - Brief Rational	There is a threatened or potentially threater downgradient of the source. The GW (condrinking water source or is equiv. to (Class There is no potentially threatened water sure of the source. The groundwater is potential irrigation or agriculture, but not presently use for Selection:	t, or not) is a current I or IIA aquifer). pply well downgradient lly usable for DW,	Limited -	There is no potentially threatener the source. The groundwater is a DW or is of limited benificial use	d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of e (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited:
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	I VA NWS	Site Name:	SWMU 00009		Groundwater Category:	Med

50.1

			Soil			
ONTAMINANT	•	Contaminant	Maximum Conc.	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
ACTOR (1)		Manganese and compounds	35.4	380.0	0.090	
HF)		Lead	9.7	400.0	0.020	(Place an "X" next to one below)
,		Mercury and compounds (inorganic)	0.12	23.0	0.010	
		Zinc	21.3	23,000.0	0.000	Significant (If Total > 100):
						Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
						Minimal (If Total < 2):
						•
			<u> </u>		0.124	
		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 		Total:	0.124	
IGRATION ATHWAY ACTOR 1PF)	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination is present at, is moving towards, moved to a point of exposure		ined - Low possibility for contamination to or migrate to a point of exposure	be present at	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X
,	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suf to make a determination of Evident or Confine	ficient			Potential:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:				
		•				(Place an "X" next to one below)
ECEPTOR	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil	Lim	ited - Little or no potential for receptors to contaminated soil	have access to	Identified:
ACTOR RF)		contaminated soil		Contaminated Soft		Potential: X
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Limited:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:				
			,			
ctivity Name:	YORKTOWN	VANWS	Site Name: SWMU 00	0009	Soil Category: (High, Medium, Low)	Med

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 11/13/95					
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW					
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00010	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):					
RMIS Site Type: LEACH FIELD	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes					
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: Med					
	SITE SUMMARY					
(Include only key elements of information	n used to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)					
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of opera-	ation, and other relevant information):					
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Del CD and at a CD-thomas (Communicator Company Water Codiment Coll	n.					
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil	.); -					
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						
2.00.2.00						
The state of the s	Dist. Giv. Participation. The same City is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ					

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Ground Water			
CONTAMINAN HAZARD FACTOR (1)	ΪΤ	Contaminant Lead	Maximum C	onc.	Standard ug/L 4.0	Ratio (2) 0,080	
(CHF)		Manganese and compounds Vanadium	3.2		182.5 260.0	0.020 0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below)
		Copper and compounds Cyanide (free)	0.8 0.014		1,400.0 730.0	0.000	Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
							Minimal (If Total < 2):
-							
		Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standa Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.			Total:	9.56E-02	
MIGRATION PATHWAY	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indic contamination in the media is moving away		Confined -	Information indicates that the po contaminant migration from the geological structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below)
FACTOR (MPF)	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at to a point of exposure; or information is not to make a determination of Evident or Confi	sufficient		geological structures of physical	controls	Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:					
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified •	There is a threatened or potentially threatene downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I	or not) is a current	Limited •	There is no potentially threatener the source. The groundwater is a DW or is of limited benificial use	d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of e (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X
	Potential -	There is no potentially threatened water support of the source. The groundwater is potentially irrigation or agriculture, but not presently us	y usable for DW,				Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
Activity Nam	e: <u>Yorktown</u>	VA NWS	Site Name:	SWMU 00010		Groundwater Category:	_Med

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year):					
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil):					
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00011	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):					
RMIS Site Type: INDUSTRIAL DISCHARGE	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes	-,				
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: NRB	NRB				
	SITE SUMMARY					
(Include only key elements of information use	ed to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)					
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	ı, and other relevant information):					
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):						
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						
	Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verifie	, ,				

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 10/10/95						
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sedi	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): SOIL					
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00012	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv,	, RD/RA, or equiv. R	CRA Stage):				
RMIS Site Type: MAINTENANCE YARD	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a	greement e.g., FFA,	Permit, Order) Yes				
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank:	High			
	SITE SUMMARY						
(Include only key elements of information us	sed to conduct the relative risk site evalu	ation. Attach map vie	w of site if desired.)				
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	on, and other relevant information):						
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):							
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):							

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

			Soi	il		
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	т	Contaminant Benzo[a]pyrene Arsenic (cancer) Benz(a)anthracene Indeno[1,2,3-ed]pyrene Benzo[k]fluoranthene (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	Maximum Conc. mu/Kg 32.0 32.8 43.0 14.0 44.0	Standard mg/Kg 6.1 32.0 61.0 61.0 61.0 61.0 Total:	Ratio (2) 5,250 1,020 0,700 0,230 0,070	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential - Brief Rational	Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed Analytical data or observable evidence indicat contamination is present at, is moving towards moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not su to make a determination of Evident or Confine e for Selection:	es that Con , or has or migrate fficient	ifined - Low possibility for contamination or migrate to a point of exposure	n to be present at	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified - Potential - Brief Rational	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil e for Selection:	Li	mited - Little or no potential for receptor contaminated soil	s to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X Limited:
Activity Nam	e: <u>YORKTOWN</u>	I VA NWS	Site Name: <u>SWMU</u>	00012	Soil Catego (High, Medium, Lov	

Lade Barbar (CV No. 11 E. PHING VOR (TOWN) VA NIVO	D. C. LO. W. d. W	.				
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year):					
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sedi					
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00013	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remy					
RMIS Site Type: INDUSTRIAL DISCHARGE	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a	ngreement e.g., FF.	A, Permit, Order) Yes			
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	<u>No</u>	Site Rank:	NRB		
	SITE SUMMARY					
(Include only key elements of information use	d to conduct the relative risk site evalu	ation. Attach map	view of site if desired.)			
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	, and other relevant information):					
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):						
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS Location (State): VA Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00014 RMIS Site Type: INDUSTRIAL DISCHARGE	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/18/96 Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): SWH SEDH SOIL Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage): Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High
(Include only key elements of information used	SITE SUMMARY It to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	and other relevant information):
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):	
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):	

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Soil			
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	r	Contaminant Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HI RDX (Cyclonite)	Maximum (mg/Kg MX) 510.0 4.9	Z	Standard mg/Kg 3,300.0 400.0	Ratio (2) 0.150 0.010	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 			Total:	0.167	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination is present at, is moving towards, moved to a point of exposure		Confined -	Low possibility for contamination or migrate to a point of exposure		(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X
	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suft to make a determination of Evident or Confined	ficient				Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationale	for Selection:					
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil		Limited ·	Little or no potential for receptor contaminated soil	rs to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: X
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil					Limited:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:					
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name:	SWMU 00014		Soil Category:	High

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Surface Wa	ater Human			
CONTAMINANT IAZARD ACTOR (1) CHF)	RDX (Cyclonite) Octohydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (F		Maximum Conc. ug/L 0.65 IMX) 0.65	Standard ug/L 61.0 1,800.0	Ratio (2) 0.010 0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):	
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		Total:	0.011		
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination in the media is present at, is mo toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at o to a point of exposure; or information is not su to make a determination of Evident or Confine	ving r migrate fficient	nfined - Information indicates a low pote to a potential point of exposure (presence of geological structures	could by due to the	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:	
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
RECEPTOR FACTOR RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surface	e water L	imited - Little or no potential for receptor surface water	s to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified:	
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to surface	e water			Potential: X Limited:	
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: <u>SWMU</u>	00014 Surfa	ace Water Human Category:	Med	

.

			Sediment Huma	n		
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	т	Contaminant Octahydro-1357-tetranitro-1357- tetrazocine (HMX)	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg	Standard mg/Kg 3,300.0	Ratio (2) 0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 		Total:	5.15E-04	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates that contamination in the media is present at, is moving toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or might of a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined	rate	Information indicates a low pote potential point of exposure (coul of geological structures or or phy	d be due to the presence	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationale					
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to sediment	Limited -	Little or no potential for receptor	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X	
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to sediment				Limited:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:				
Activity Name	e: <u>Yorktown</u>	VA NWS Sid	te Name: SWMU 00014		Sediment Human Category: (High, Medium, Low)	<u>Med</u>

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS Location (State): VA Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00015 RMIS Site Type: SEWAGE EFFLUENT SETTLING PONDS Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 12/14/95 Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SEDH SEDEM SOIL Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage): Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: Med
(Include only key elements of information used	SITE SUMMARY I to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	and other relevant information):
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):	2
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):	

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Ground Water	•		
ONTANDAN	17 7 0						
ONTAMINAN IAZARD	T	Contouring	Maximum (Conc.	Standard	5	
ACTOR (1)		Contaminant Vanadium	ug/L 329.0	***************************************	ug/L	Ratio (2)	
CHF)		Manganese and compounds	155.0		260.0 182.5	1.290 0.850	(DI
Jir)		Nickel and compounds 263 Barium and compounds 849			730.0	0.850	(Place an "X" next to one below)
					2,600.0	0.330	GI IM (/tem i I i ion)
		HCH (beta)	0.05		3.7	0.010	Significant (If Total > 100):
		DDT	0.16		20.0	0.010	M-J (TET 3 100)
		Trichloroethane, 1,1,1-	7.0	*****************	1,300.0	0.010	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		Dichloroethane, 1,1-	0.6		810.0	0.000	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standa 	rd		Total:	2.857	
		Note: Only top ten contaminants are displaye	d.		·		
MIGRATION Evident - PATHWAY FACTOR		Analytical data or observable evidence indica contamination in the media is moving away f		Confined -	Information indicates that the pote		(Place an "X" next to one below)
		Containment in the media is moving away from the source.			contaminant migration from the se geological structures or physical c	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Evident:
APF)	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at	or migrate				Potential: X
		to a point of exposure; or information is not s to make a determination of Evident or Confir					Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:					
ECEPTOR	Identified -	There is a threatened or potentially threatened	d water supply	Limited •	There is no potentially threatened	water supply well downgradient of	(Place an "X" next to one below)
ACTOR		downgradient of the source. The GW (cont.	or not) is a current		the source. The groundwater is no	ot considered a potential source of	Identified:
tF)		drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I	or IIA aquiler).		DW or is of limited benificial use	(IIIA, IIIB or perched aquiter).	Potential: X
	Potential -	There is no potentially threatened water supp					
		of the source. The groundwater is potentially irrigation or agriculture, but not presently use	•				Limited:
	Brief Rationale	for Selection:					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
ctivity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name:	SWMU 00015		Groundwater Category:	Med
THE CALLED	TORRIGIAN	4.5.6.2.1.1.10	Dite (Mille)	511110 00013		(High, Medium, Low)	17150

				Soil		
CONTAMINANT IAZARD	•	Contaminant	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
ACTOR (1)		Arsenic (cancer)	19.2	32.0	0.600	
CHF)		Manganese and compounds	175.0	380.0	0.460	(Place an "X" next to one below)
		Antimony and compounds	4.0	31.0	0.130	
		Beryllium and compounds	0.61	14.0	0.040	Significant (If Total > 100):
						Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
						Minimal (If Total < 2):
		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 		Total:	1,233	
IIGRATION ATHWAY ACTOR MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination is present at, is moving towards, moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suft to make a determination of Evident or Confined	or has migrate Ticient	confined - Low possibility for contamination or migrate to a point of exposure	to be present at	(Place an "X" next to one below Evident: X Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationale					
RECEPTOR FACTOR RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil	:	Limited - Little or no potential for receptors contaminated soil	s to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below Identified: Potential: X
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Limited:
		e for Selection:				

the statement of the

			Sedi	ment Human			
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (I) (CHF)	Γ	Contaminant Mercury and compounds (inorganic) DDT DDE, 4,4- DDD, 4,4- Chlordane, gamma- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg 0.44 0.086 0.031 0.049		Standard mg/Kg 23.0 130.0 130.0 190.0 34.0 Total:	Ratio (2) 0.020 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates t contamination in the media is present at, is movin toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or m to a point of exposure; or information is not suffic to make a determination of Evident or Confined	igrate		information indicates a low poter potential point of exposure (could of geological structures or or phy	d be due to the presence	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified - Potential -	e for Selection: Receptors identified that have access to sediment Potential for receptors to have access to sediment		Limited •	Little or no potential for receptor	s to have access to sediment	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X Limited:
Activity Name		e for Selection:	Site Name: <u>S</u>	WMU 00015		Sediment Human Category:	Med

			Surface V	Vater Eco Marine			
ONTAMINANT IAZARD ACTOR (1) CHF)		Contaminant DDD,4,4- DDT DDF,4,4- Mercury and compounds (inorganic) Chlordane, gamma- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg 0.049 0.086 0.031 0.44 0.0054		Standard mg/Kg 0.002 0.15 0.0005	Ratio (2) 0.050 0.040 0.020 0.000 0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION ATHWAY ACTOR MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination in the media is present at, is more toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not sure to make a determination of Evident or Confine the for Selection:	es that ving r migrate fficient	poten	nation indicates a low poter tial point of exposure (coul- plogical structures or or phy	ntial for contamination to a d be due to the presence sical controls)	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified •	Receptors identified that have access to sedime	ent	Limited - Little	or no potential for receptor	rs to have access to sediment	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X
	Potential - Brief Rational	Potential for receptors to have access to sedim e for Selection:	ent				Limited:

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 6/5/95
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00016	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):
RMIS Site Type: SURFACE DISPOSAL AREA	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: Low
	SITE SUMMARY
(Include only key elements of information used	d to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	, and other relevant information):
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):	
bile bescription of Lutting's (Ground water, business Francis, southern, south	
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):	
	'

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contaminatio (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

			(Ground Water	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
CONTAMINAN HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	T	Contaminant (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.	Maximum Co ug/L	nc.	Standard ug/L Total:	Ratio (2)	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates to contamination in the media is moving away from Possibility for contamination to be present at or n to a point of exposure; or information is not suffict to make a determination of Evident or Confined	the source.	Confined •	Information indicates that the po contaminant migration from the geological structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified -	There is a threatened or potentially threatened wa downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. or not drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I or II There is no potentially threatened water supply wo the source. The groundwater is potentially use	ot) is a current A aquifer). ell downgradient ble for DW,	Limited •	There is no potentially threatene the source. The groundwater is DW or is of limited benificial us	d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of e (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited: X
	Brief Rationa	irrigation or agriculture, but not presently used (C	iass IIB aquiter).				
Activity Nam	ie: <u>YORKTOW</u>	v va nws	Site Name:	SWMU 00016		Groundwater Category:	Low

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS Location (State): VA Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00017 RMIS Site Type: UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year) Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sedin Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of a)	nent, Soil): <u>GW</u> RD/RA, or equiv. I	RCRA Stage):		
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):		Site Rank:	High	
(Include only key elements of information used	SITE SUMMARY	ation. Attach map vi	ew of site if desired.)		
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	, and other relevant information):				
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):					e de la companya de l
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):	!				
	V				

(or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

(1) Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination

Page 1 - Relative Risk Evaluation Worksheet

	<u> </u>			Ground Water			1. d.
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (I) (CHF)	,	Contaminant Manganese and compounds Aluminum Mercury and compounds (inorganic) Heptachlor epoxide (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.	Maximum C ug/L 1,670.0 56,000.0 1.8 0.1		Standard ug/L 182.5 37,000.0 11.0 0.74 Total:	Ratio (2) 9.150 1.530 0.160 0.140	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is moving away from . Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suff to make a determination of Evident or Confined	n the source. migrate ficient	Confined •	Information indicates that the po contaminant migration from the geological structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:					
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified - Potential - Brief Rationale	There is a threatened or potentially threatened w downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. or a drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I or There is no potentially threatened water supply of the source. The groundwater is potentially us irrigation or agriculture, but not presently used (e for Selection:	not) is a current IIA aquifer). well downgradient sable for DW,	Limited •	There is no potentially threatene the source. The groundwater is DW or is of limited benificial us	d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of e (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited:
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name:	SWMU 00017		Groundwater Category:	High

				Soil			
CONTAMINANT IAZARD 'ACTOR (1) CHF)	r	Contaminant Manganese and compounds Aluminum Arsenic (cancer) Beryllium and compounds	Maximum Con- mg/Kg 75.0 10,500.0 2.8 0.31	C.	Standard mg/Kg 380.0 77,000.0 32.0 14.0	Ratio (2) 0.200 0.140 0.090 0.020	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standare Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed			Total:	0.443	
MIGRATION PATHWAY PACTOR MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicat contamination is present at, is moving towards moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at c to a point of exposure; or information is not su to make a determination of Evident or Confine	, or has or migrate fficient		possibility for contamination	n to be present at	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:	•				
RECEPTOR FACTOR RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil			e or no potential for receptors	s to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil					Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: S	SWMU 00017		Soil Category:	Med

The state of the s	Data Enternal (Day, Marsh, Varra). 10/10/05
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 10/10/95
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW SOIL
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00018 (\$175.26)	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):
RMIS Site Type: UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: Med
(Include only key elements of information use	SITE SUMMARY d to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)
(Include only key elements of information use	4 to conduct the foliation flow site of the analysis of the site o
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	, and other relevant information):
,	
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):	
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):	

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

			Gr	round Water			
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	T	Contaminant Dichloroethane, 1,1- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.	Maximum Conc. ug/L 160.0		Standard ug/L 810.0 Total:	Ratio (2) 0.200	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is moving away from Possibility for contamination to be present at or n to a point of exposure; or information is not suffic to make a determination of Evident or Confined	the source.	Confined -	Information indicates that the po contaminant migration from the geofogical structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified - Potential -	There is a threatened or potentially threatened wa downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. or not drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I or II There is no potentially threatened water supply wo fithe source. The groundwater is potentially use irrigation or agriculture, but not presently used (Control of Selection:	ot) is a current A aquifer). vell downgradient able for DW,	Limited -	There is no potentially threatene the source. The groundwater is DW or is of limited benificial us	d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of e (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X Limited:
Activity Name	e: YORKTOWN	I VA NWS	Site Name: <u>S</u>	WMU 00018	(SITE 26)	Groundwater Category:	Med

			So	oil .		
ONTAMINANT IAZARD		Contaminant	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
ACTOR (1)		Manganese and compounds	548.0	380.0	0.160	(Place an "X" next to one below)
HF)		Aluminum	12,600.0	77,000.0 6.1	0.150	(Place all A hext to one below)
		Benzo[a]pyrene	0,9	32.0	0.050	Significant (If Total > 100):
		Arsenic (cancer)	1.6	14.0	0.020	Significant (II Total > 100).
		Beryllium and compounds	0.14	6.1	0.020	Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
		Dibenz[ah]anthracene Benz(a)anthracene	1.4	61.0	0.020	
			1.1	61.0	0.020	Minimal (If Total < 2):
		Benzo[b]fluoranthene	1.1	01.0		
		Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		Total:	1.892	
	Evident •	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination is present at, is moving towards moved to a point of exposure		nfined - Low possibility for contamination to or migrate to a point of exposure	pe present at	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X
ACTOR MPF)	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at o to a point of exposure; or information is not su to make a determination of Evident or Confine	fficient			Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
RECEPTOR FACTOR RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil	ւ	imited - Little or no potential for receptors to contaminated soil	have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X
	Potentiai -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
Activity Name		144 NN/O	Site Name: SWMU	100018 (517E-26)	Soil Category:	Med

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/18/96 Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): GW Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remy, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):					
Location (State): VA						
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00019						
RMIS Site Type: CONTAMINATED SEDIMENTS	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of ag					
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank:	Med		
	SITE SUMMARY					
(Include only key elements of information used	d to conduct the relative risk site evalua	tion. Attach map view	of site if desired.)			
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	, and other relevant information):					
District Control of Co						
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):						
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological).						

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contaminatio (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Ground Water			
CONTAMINANT IAZARD ACTOR (1) CHF)	.	Contaminant Lead Arsenic (cancer) Manganese and compounds Aluminum Antimony and compounds Barium and compounds Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) RDX (Cyclonite) Dinitrotoluene, 2,4- Dinitrotoluene, 2,6- (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standar	Maximum Coug/L 175.0 122.0 2,530.0 199,000.0 40.9 1,060.0 82.0 2.2 0.27 0.27		Standard ug/L 4.0 3.8 182.5 37,000.0 15.0 2,600.0 480.0 61.0 73.0 37.0	Ratio (2) 43.750 32.110 13.860 5.450 2.800 0.410 0.170 0.040 0.000 0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential - Brief Rational	Note: Only top ten contaminants are displaye Analytical data or observable evidence indica contamination in the media is moving away f Possibility for contamination to be present at to a point of exposure; or information is not s to make a determination of Evident or Confine for Selection:	d. tes that rom the source. or migrate ufficient	Confined -	Information indicates that the po contaminant migration from the geological structures or physical	source is limited (due to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified - Potential - Brief Rational	There is a threatened or potentially threatene downgradient of the source. The GW (cont. drinking water source or is equiv. to (Class I There is no potentially threatened water supp of the source. The groundwater is potentially irrigation or agriculture, but not presently use e for Selection:	or not) is a current or IIA aquifer). ly well downgradient v usable for DW,	Limited -	There is no potentially threatene the source. The groundwater is DW or is of limited benificial us	d water supply well downgradient of not considered a potential source of e (IIIA, IIIB or perched aquifer).	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X Limited:
Activity Name	e: <u>YORKTOWN</u>	VA NWS	Site Name:	SWMU 00019		Groundwater Category: (High, Medium, Low)	_Med

·							
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/18/96						
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): SWEF						
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00020	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):						
RMIS Site Type: CONTAMINATED SEDIMENTS	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes						
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High						
	SITE SUMMARY						
(Include only key elements of information used	d to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)						
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation,	and other relevant information):						
·	, and sales a section and a se						
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):							
	·						
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):							

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

Contaminant Contaminant Contaminant Contaminant Contamination Cont				Surface Wat	er Eco Fresh		
(2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. MIGRATION ATHWAY PACTOR MPF) Potential - Possibility for contamination to be present at or migrate to a point of exposure; or information is not sufficient to make a determination of Evident or Confined Brief Rationale for Selection: Identified - Receptors identified that have access to surface water Potential - Potential for receptors to have access to surface water Potential - Potential for receptors to have access to surface water Limited: Limited: Limited: Limited: Limited: Limited: Limited:	ACTOR (1)	r	Dieldrin Heptachlor epoxide DDE,4,4-	ug/L 7.4 3.0	ug/L 0.0019 0.0038 0.0	3894.740 789.470 0.000	Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
RECEPTOR Identified - Receptors identified that have access to surface water Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to surface water Surface water Surface water Potential - Potential for receptors to have access to surface water Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to surface water Limited - Little or no potential for receptors to have access to surface water Limited:	ATHWAY ACTOR		(2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination in the media is present at, is movi toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suff	ng migrate icient	nfined - Information indicates a low poter to a potential point of exposure (ntial for contamination could be due to the	Evident:
RECEPTOR Identified - Receptors identified that have access to surface water		Brief Rational	e for Selection:				(Place an "X" next to one below)
Limited:	ACTOR	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surface	water L	•	s to have access to	Identified: X
Brief Rationale for Selection:		Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to surface	water			Limited:
		Brief Rational	e for Selection:				

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/18/96				
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): SWEF SEDEF				
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00021	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):				
RMIS Site Type: CONTAMINATED SEDIMENTS	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes				
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High				
(Include only key elements of information use Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	SITE SUMMARY ed to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.) a, and other relevant information):				
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):					
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):					

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contaminatio (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

CONTAMINAN IAZARD	Т	Contaminant Aroclor	Maximum Conc. ug/L 18.0	Standard ug/L 0,014	Ratio (2) 1285.710	
ACTOR (1) CHF)		Mercury	0,48	0.012	40,000	(Place an "X" next to one below)
						Significant (If Total > 100):
						Moderate (If Total 2 - 100):
						Minimal (If Total < 2):
		 Evaluate for human contaminants only Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. 		Total:	1325.710	
IGRATION	Evident -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicate		d - Information indicates a low potent		(Place an "X" next to one below)
PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)		contamination in the media is present at, is mov toward, or has moved to a point of exposure	ing	to a potential point of exposure (c presence of geological structures of		Evident:
	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suf to make a determination of Evident or Confined	ficient			Potential: X Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				
				. Date	4- have	(Place an "X" next to one below)
ECEPTOR ACTOR	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to surface	water Limited	 d - Little or no potential for receptors surface water 	to nave access to	Identified: X
RF)	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to surface	water			Potential:
	- **********					Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:				

			Sediment Eco	Fresh		
ONTAMINANT AZARD ACTOR (1) SHF)	,	Contaminant Aroclor (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	Maximum Conc. ug/L 270.0	Standard mg/Kg 0.07	Ratio (2) 5400.000	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION ATHWAY ACTOR MPF)	Evident - Potential - Brief Rationale	Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Analytical data or observable evidence indicate: contamination in the media is present at, is mov toward, or has moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suft to make a determination of Evident or Confined	ing migrate icient	ed - Information indicates a low poter potential point of exposure (coul of geological structures or or phy	d be due to the presence	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: Potential: X Confined:
ECEPTOR ACTOR RF)	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to sedime. Potential for receptors to have access to sedime		ed - Little or no potential for receptor	s to have access to sediment	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: X Potential: Limited:
	Brief Rationals	e for Selection:				
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: <u>SWMU 000</u>	21	Sediment Fresh Category:	<u>High</u>

·	
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/18/96
Location (State): VA	Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): SOIL
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00022	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage):
RMIS Site Type: SURFACE DISPOSAL AREA	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) Yes
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High
	SITE SUMMARY
(Include only key elements of i	nformation used to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, date	s of operation, and other relevant information):
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sedin	nent, Soil):
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):	
2.10. 2.00	
	_

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

				Soil			
CONTAMINAN' HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	т	Contaminant Lead Manganese Chromium VI and compounds Cadmium and compounds Arsenic (noncancer) Zinc Beryllium and compounds (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg 3,100.0 1,500.0 1,600.0 120.0 41.0 7,700.0 0.45	3. 23.	ndard 19/Kg 00.0 30.0 000.0 38.0 22.0 000.0 14.0	Ratio (2) 7.750 4.690 4.210 3.160 1.860 0.330 0.030	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential - Brief Rational	Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed. Analytical data or observable evidence indicate contamination is present at, is moving towards, moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suft to make a determination of Evident or Confined to the present at or to sufficient to the present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suft to make a determination of Evident or Confined	es that or has r migrate Ticient	Confined - Low possibilit or migrate to a	y for contamination to point of exposure	be present at	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified - Potential - Brief Rational	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil le for Selection:		Limited - Little or no po contaminated		have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X Limited:
Activity Name	4444		Site Name: <u>SW</u>	VMU 00022		Soil Category:	<u> High</u>

Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 3/18/96 Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): SOIL					
Location (State): VA						
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00023	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, R	RD/RA, or equiv. RO	CRA Stage):			
RMIS Site Type: SURFACE DISPOSAL AREA	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agr	eement e.g., FFA, F	Permit, Order) Yes			
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N):	No	Site Rank: High			
	SITE SUMMARY					
(Include only key elements of information u	used to conduct the relative risk site evaluation	on. Attach map viev	v of site if desired.)			
					1	
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operati	on, and other relevant information):					
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,					
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):						
			•			
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

			Soil			
CONTAMINANT HAZARD FACTOR (I) (CHF)		Contaminant Arsenic (noncancer) Beryllium and compounds	Maximum Conc. mg/Kg 160.0 1.2	Standard mg/Kg 22.0 14.0	Ratio (2) 7.270 0.090	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100):
						Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): X Minimal (If Total < 2):
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.		Total:	7.360	
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential -	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates contamination is present at, is moving towards, of moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at or to a point of exposure; or information is not suff to make a determination of Evident or Confined	or has migrate	- Low possibility for contamination or migrate to a point of exposure	to be present at	(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
	Brief Rationale					Commed.
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified •	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil	Limited	Little or no potential for receptors contaminated soil	to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: X
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil				Limited:
	Brief Rationale	e for Selection:		·		
Activity Name	: YORKTOWN	VA NWS	Site Name: SWMU 00023		Soil Category:	High

•						
Installation/Site Name for FUDS YORKTOWN VA NWS	Date Entered (Day, Month, Year): 7/8/96 Media Evaluated (GW, SW, Sediment, Soil): SEDEF SOIL					
Location (State): VA						
Site (Name/RMIS ID) / Project for FUDS: SWMU 00024	Phase of Exec. (SI, RI, FS, Remv, RD/RA, or equiv. RCRA Stage): CERCLA PA					
RMIS Site Type: INCINERATOR	Agr. Status (Y/N, If yes, type of agreement e.g., FFA, Permit, Order) No					
Point of Contact (Name/Phone):	National Priority List (Y/N): No Site Rank: High					
	SITE SUMMARY					
(Include only key elements of information u	used to conduct the relative risk site evaluation. Attach map view of site if desired.)					
Brief Site Description (Include site type, materials disposed of, dates of operation	on, and other relevant information):					
Brief Description of Pathways (Groundwater, Surface Water, Sediment, Soil):						
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
	·					
Brief Description of Receptors (Human and Ecological):						

⁽¹⁾ Use to record information on Sites and Areas of Concern (AOC) for Relative Risk Site Evaluation. The term Site is defined as a discrete area for which suspected contamination has been verified and requ A Site by definition has been, or will be, entered into RMIS. For the FUDS Program, "projects" equates to sites for current installations. An AOC is a discrete area of contamination, or suspected contamination (or RFA) phase that has not been entered into RMIS.

			S	oil		
CONTAMINAN HAZARD FACTOR (1) (CHF)	T	Contaminant Vanadium Lead Arsenic (cancer) Beryllium and compounds Mercury and compounds (methyl) Iron (1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard		Standard mg/Kg 540.0 400.0 32.0 14.0 6.5 23,000.0	Ratio (2) 20.740 5.750 2.620 0.420 0.130 0.000	(Place an "X" next to one below) Significant (If Total > 100): Moderate (If Total 2 - 100): X Minimal (If Total < 2):
MIGRATION PATHWAY FACTOR (MPF)	Evident - Potential - Brief Rationals	Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed Analytical data or observable evidence indicat contamination is present at, is moving towards moved to a point of exposure Possibility for contamination to be present at to a point of exposure; or information is not su to make a determination of Evident or Confine e for Selection:	es that Co c, or has or migrate officient	nfined - Low possibility for contamination or migrate to a point of exposur		(Place an "X" next to one below) Evident: X Potential: Confined:
RECEPTOR FACTOR (RF)	Identified - Potential -	Receptors identified that have access to contaminated soil Potential for receptors to have access to contaminated soil e for Selection:	L	imited - Little or no potential for recepto contaminated soil	ors to have access to	(Place an "X" next to one below) Identified: Potential: Limited: X
Activity Name	e: <u>YORKTOWN</u>	VA NWS	Site Name: <u>SWMU</u>	00024	Soil Category:	Med

			S	Sediment Eco Fr	esh		
							•
ONTAMINAN' AZARD	r	Contaminant	Maximum (ug/L	Conc.	Standard mg/Kg	Ratio (2)	
ACTOR (1)		Lead	80.3		31,0	2.290	
HF)		Arsenic (cancer)	20.1		33.0	0.610	(Place an "X" next to one below)
		Chromium VI and compounds	39.4		2.6	0.490	Significant (If Total > 100):
							2
			······································				Moderate (If Total 2 • 100):
							Minimal (If Total < 2):
						4.400	•
		(1) Evaluate for human contaminants only (2) Ratio = Maximum Concentration/Standard			Total:	3.390	
		Note: Only top ten contaminants are displayed.					:
						•	
CD ATION	Evident •	Analytical data or observable evidence indicates	that	Confined -	Information indicates a low potenti	al for contamination to a	(Place an "X" next to one below)
IGRATION ATHWAY	Evident.	contamination in the media is present at, is moving		Commea •	potential point of exposure (could be		(Flace all 14 How to one below)
CTOR		toward, or has moved to a point of exposure			of geological structures or or physic	cal controls)	Evident: X
1PF)	Potential -	Possibility for contamination to be present at or r					Potential:
		to a point of exposure; or information is not suffi to make a determination of Evident or Confined	cient				Confined:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					
							(Place an "X" next to one below)
ECEPTOR	Identified -	Receptors identified that have access to sediment	i	Limited -	Little or no potential for receptors t	o have access to sediment	(Flace all A flext to one below)
ACTOR		·					Identified:
(F)							Potential: X_
	Potential -	Potential for receptors to have access to sediment	t				Limited:
	Brief Rational	e for Selection:					- 4
							
ativity Na-a	• VOBUTOUR	NA NING	Site Name:	SWMU 00024		Sediment Fresh Category:	High
cuvity Name	: YORKTOWN	AV 17/1/2	Date Hailler	3 W MO 00024		(High, Medium, Low)	

APPENDIX B
DETAILED ACTUAL SCHEDULES FOR COMPLETED ACTIONS
(REMOVAL ACTIONS AND FINALIZED REPORTS)
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Figure B - 1

FY 1994: Site 5 Risk Assessment, Proposed Plan, and Record of Decision
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia




Figure B - 1
FY 1994: Site 5 Risk Assessment, Proposed Plan, and Record of Decision
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

				Γ			***************************************	1994												1995	
	Days	Start	Finish	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
ORD OF DECISION	302ed	12/1/93	9/29/94												-			1			
inary Draft	33ed	12/1/93	1/3/94						·		j	!				en de la companya de					
w (Navy)	29ed	1/3/94	2/1/94						Ш												
	29ed	2/1/94	3/2/94							₩											
w (EPA/State)	61ed	3/2/94	5/2/94									щ				÷					
Final	30ed	5/2/94	6/1/94													:					
	120ed	6/1/94	9/29/94									:									

Figure B - 2
FY 1993: Removal Action at Sites 4, 16, and 21
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia




Figure B - 3
FY 1994: Sites 6, 7, 12, 16, SSA 16 and Background Work Plan / Field Investigation
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia




Figure B - 4
FY 1993: Removal Action at Sites 2, 9 and SSA 4
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia




Figure B - 5
FY 1994: Removal Action at Site Screening Areas 1, 2 and 5
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia




Figure B - 5
FY 1994: Removal Action at Site Screening Areas 1, 2 and 5
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

									T										1994						1						1995
	Days	Start	Finish	S	0	N	D	J	F	М	Α	М	J	J	Α	S	0	N	D	J	. F	M	Α	М	J	J					
oval Action - SSA 2	19ed	8/3/94	8/22/94		;																										
oval Action - SSA 5	22ed	8/11/94	9/2/94													22															
oval Action • SSA 1	89cd	8/3/94	10/31/94															22		•											
irmation Sampling - 3 SSAs	84ed	8/8/94	10/31/94															22													
Analysis/Data Validation	77 e d	8/15/94	10/31/94															22													
ct Closeout	31ed	10/5/94	11/5/94	1																											

Figure B - 6
FY 1995: Removal Action at Site Screening Area 18
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia




Figure B - 7
FY 1994: Removal Action at Site Screening Area 17
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

	T	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Τ	1994													1995								
	Days	Start	Finish	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep		
SCREENING AREA 17	511ed	1/10/94	6/5/95																							
CA REPORT	106ed	1/10/94	4/26/94		 	į.	1	}				:														
ninary Draft	25ed	1/10/94	2/4/94																							
ew (Navy)	17ed	2/4/94	2/21/94	1	:																					
	30ed	2/21/94	3/23/94		8																					
LIC COMMENT	30ed	3/20/94	4/19/94			. =												i								
	7ed	4/19/94	4/26/94		:	: '	2	1																		
IOVAL ACTION MORANDUM	44ed	4/26/94	6/9/94				•	+	+				:													
t	7ed	4/26/94	5/3/94						-						:				:					:		
ew (Navy/EPA/State)	30ed	5/3/94	6/2/94	-					щ																	
1	7ed	6/2/94	6/9/94						23	! •											:					
IOVAL ACTION	150ed	1/10/94	6/9/94	-			<u> </u>		_											•						
Design	100ed	1/10/94	4/20/94						1	•	Mark try No.													3		
ew (Navy)	30ed	4/20/94	5/20/94		ľ	!			•				3					•	1					1		
l Design	20ed	5/20/94	6/9/94					8											÷			i .	:	÷		
MOVAL ACTION	301ed	8/8/94	6/5/95	5	!						_		1						1	1	•	:				

)

Figure B - 8 FY 1994: York River Basin Background Report Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

											1995					
	Days	Start	Finish	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Арг	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
RK RIVER BASIN CKGROUND REPORT	288ed	12/1/94	9/15/95													
minary Draft	90ed	12/1/94	3/1/95								·		1			
iew (Navy)	30ed	3/1/95	3/31/95					m								
n .	17ed	3/31/95	4/17/95	1												
ew (EPA/State)	60ed	4/17/95	6/16/95					(III)		minnon	•					
1	35ed	6/16/95	7/21/95													

Figure B - 9
FY 1995: Sites 4 and 21 Post-Removal Confirmation Sampling Report and Baseline Risk Assessment, Proposed Plan, and Record of Decision Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

										1995												1996
:	Days	Start	Finish	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Α	S	0	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J
6S 4 and 21	298ed	1/23/95	11/17/95															,				
T-REMOVAL CONFIRMATION SAMPLING ORT AND BASELINE RISK ASSESSMENT	298ed	1/23/95	11/17/95			. k	i 1	<u> </u>	-		1		+	-								
1	42ed	3/23/95	5/4/95			E																
iew (EPA/State)	92ed	5/4/95	8/4/95					: 00000	uļuma	шфишии	ф											
A Final	47ed	8/4/95	9/20/95												:							
iew (EPA/State)	29ed	9/20/95	10/19/95			,						0	mhinno									
1	29ed	10/19/95	11/17/95								e.		8									
)POSED PLAN	92ed	4/25/95	7/26/95					<u> </u>	<u> </u>					•								
A	31ed	4/25/95	5/26/95							ı			į		And the state of t							
iew (EPA/State)	61ed	5/26/95	7/26/95									1					1			:		
CORD OF DECISION	91ed	6/22/95	9/21/95				-			-	į .	-					: :					
ft	32ed	6/22/95	7/24/95				-															
iew (EPA/State)	59ed	7/24/95	9/21/95		f .	•				•												


Figure B - 10

FY 1995: Site 16 and SSA 16 Remedial Investigation, Feasibility Study, Proposed Plan, and Record of Decision
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

			····		Т				********	1995						1				<u> </u>	-	1996							
	Days	Start	Finish	D	<u> </u>	F	M	A	М	1993		A S	0	N	D	<u> </u>	F	M	A	М	J	1996		A S	C) N	ı D	ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	F
S 16 and SSA 16	294ed	12/23/94	10/13/95		Ţ									•••		Ī	· · · · ·					 -			<u>-</u> -	•	·	T	
IEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT	210ed	12/23/94	7/21/95	1	ļ.,,	1	4	<u> </u>	1			•																	
minary Draft	62ed	12/23/94	2/23/95				1																						
ew (Navy)	25ed	2/24/95	3/21/95				фш																						
1	30ed	3/21/95	4/20/95				8																						
iew (EPA/State)	69ed	4/20/95	6/28/95					0	njaman	ýmmo																			
1	23ed	6/28/95	7/21/95							· •	3							÷								•			
)POSED PLAN	179ed	1/23/95	7/21/95			1	4	1	<u> </u>	+ +								•											
iminary Draft	58ed	1/23/95	3/22/95														:		:				•		:				
iew (Navy)	48ed	3/23/95	5/10/95				•	aļman	m								1								ı	į	,		
a	9ed	5/10/95	5/19/95				:		■		1															i	:		
iew (EPA/State)	33ed	5/19/95	6/21/95				1		a											1		:							
ıl	30ed	6/21/95	7/21/95				1	:			33									1					-				
BLIC COMMENT PERIOD	45ed	7/25/95	9/8/95								-	—						1					•			1			
CORD OF DECISION	204ed	3/23/95	10/13/95					-			_		- 1				1	į	***************************************					!	:	•			
iminary Draft	29ed	3/23/95	4/21/95												:									:					
iew (Navy)	42ed	4/21/95	6/2/95					1		m	:				i				į						:	1			
ñ	17ed	6/2/95	6/19/95								:				į		1	i					i	1	i				
iew (EPA/State)	30ed	6/19/95	7/19/95									i			ļ					:		i				į			
A Final	19ed	7/19/95	8/7/95									1 .													:				
iew (EPA/State)	60ed	8/7/95	10/6/95							:	1	سننست	unii)				i	:	Ì				A delivery of the second	į	!	:			
al	7ed	10/6/95	10/13/95					:		1	į		8	;					:			į							

NOTE: The Draft Final Deliverable was not submitted due to limited Government comments.


Figure B - 11
FY 1995: Sites 9 and 19 Work Plan/Field Investigation
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia



à

Figure B - 12

FY 1994: Site Screening Areas 1, 6, 7, and 15 Work Plan/Field Investigation/SSP Report
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia



1

Figure B - 13

FY 1995: Site Screening Areas 2, 17, 18 and 19 Work Plan/Field Investigation/SSP Report
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

		T							Т					1	995						T							1996
,k	Days	Start	Finish	Α	S	0	N	D	J	F	M	Α	М	J	J	A	S	0	N	Ĺ) ,	J	F	M	A	M	J	J
E SCREENING AREAS 2, 17, 18 and 19	594ed	8/15/94	3/31/96	822																					3			i
P WORK PLAN	179ed	8/15/94	2/10/95			ļ.,	-	 		<u></u>																		
ıft .	31ed	8/15/94	9/15/94	- E		•																						
view (Navy)	61ed	9/15/94	11/15/94			DiODRAD																						
oft Final	30ed	11/15/94	12/15/94			,	:																					
view (EPA/State)	31ed	12/15/94	1/15/95					m																				
al	26ed	1/15/95	2/10/95			٠				****								i i										
FIELD INVESTIGATION	59ed	1/15/95	3/15/95							1			:			i		;										
bilization _	1 ed	2/6/95	2/7/95			: : :				: 1					•									i				
ld Investigation	12ed	2/8/95	2/20/95					:				١.						Name of the last										
MPLE ANALYSIS/VALIDATION	70ed	2/1/95	4/12/95				1	:																				
mple Analysis	54ed	2/8/95	4/3/95					: .					-					Hara Marcallon										4
ta Validation	28ed	3/20/95	4/17/95					•			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						:											
P REPORT	349ed	4/17/95	3/31/96			•									l			i		-			i	<u>i</u>	TÎ.			•
:liminary Draft	56ed	4/17/95	6/12/95											****	!		1	!	•					1				
view (Navy)	29ed	6/13/95	7/12/95				•													:								
aft	32ed	7/13/95	8/14/95												, 2		,		÷									
view (EPA/State)	62ed	8/15/95	10/16/95	1		1	:								:									i				
aft Final	31ed	10/16/95	11/16/95	1										1						3								
view (EPA/State)	76ed	11/16/95	1/31/96	1																umbr			ĺ					
nal	47ed	1/31/96	3/18/96	1														1							•			

Note: Work Plan Production was funded in FY 1994.

Figure B-14
FY 1996: Removal Action at Site Screening Areas 3 and 7
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

					1995							***************************************	·		··········	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1996				······			
Task	Days	Start	~~~~	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug
SITE SCREENING AREAS 3 and 7	506ed	1/17/95	6/6/96		**																			
EE/CA REPORT	135ed	1/17/95	6/1/95																		-			
Draft (LANTDIV only)	59ed	1/17/95	3/17/95																	4. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10		***************************************		4.74
Navy Review	10ed	3/17/95	3/27/95																			-		
Draft	9ed	3/27/95	4/5/95																	To the second se		-		
Review (EPA/State/Navy)	30ed	4/5/95	5/5/95																					
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD	31ed	4/21/95	5/22/95									Carrier Management Accounts										1		
Final	27ed	5/5/95	6/1/95							8														
REMOVAL ACTION MEMORANDUM	51ed	5/2/95	6/22/95											10 P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P						The state of the s	AND DESIGNATION OF THE PARTY OF			
Draft	30ed	5/2/95	6/1/95							3									7					
Review (Navy/EPA/State)	14ed	6/1/95	6/15/95																	The state of the s				
Final	7ed	6/15/95	6/22/95							133				,							Land of the control o			
REMOVAL ACTION DESIGN	135ed	1/17/95	6/1/95																					
100% Design	70ed	1/17/95	3/28/95																					1
Review (Navy/EPA/State)	38ed	3/28/95	5/5/95					10111111111	<u> </u>			- Control of the Cont												
Final Design	27ed	5/5/95	6/1/95				'			 		7												
REMOVAL ACTION	190ed	1/8/96	7/16/96						60000000					!	:									•

APPENDIX C DETAILED SCHEDULES FOR REMOVAL ACTIONS NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA There are no Removal Actions currently scheduled.

APPENDIX D

DETAILED SCHEDULES: FY 1995


NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Figure D - 1 FY 1995: Bench-Scale Treatability Study Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

[I		Т		-	19	95				Т]	996				Τ			19	97				
Task	Description	Days	Start	Finish	O N	DΙ	Fλ	1 A	МJ	J A	S	0	N D	J	F M	1 A	M.	J	A S	0	N D	J	F M	A	МJ	J A	S	0 1	1 D	J F
PHASE I	SOIL CHARACTERIZATION/COLLECTION	125ed	10/1/94	2/3/95											-						,									
Task 1	Soil Characterization	93ed	10/1/94	1/2/95								-		***************************************	opposite and a second					-										
	Project Scope Development	61ed	10/1/94	12/1/94											tipe de une man de															
	Soil Characterization Work Plan	61ed	10/1/94	12/1/94											- red color added describe		i					-								
	Navy Review	7ed	12/1/94	12/8/94																										
	Field Preparation/Mobilization	5ed	12/5/94	12/10/94	8					-		TATELON DESCRIPTION OF THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN NAMED IN COL		and the second of the second														. !		
	Field Investigation	5ed	12/12/94	12/17/94		8						***************************************																		
	Laboratory Analysis	20ed	12/13/94	1/2/95					1	-		Andrews about the contract of		and the state of the state of																
Task 2	Soil Characterization Evaluation	7ed	1/5/95	1/12/95		•						-		-								and the second s								
	Meeting @LANTDIV	0ed	1/5/95	1/5/95		\Pi								-																
	Meeting Summary	6ed	1/6/95	1/12/95		B																								
Task 3	Soil Sample Collection	21ed	1/13/95	2/3/95									-																	
	Field Preparation	2ed	1/13/95	1/15/95		1											4											***************************************		***************************************
	Soil Collection	3ed	1/16/95	1/19/95		1											,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,													
	Laboratory Analysis	7ed	1/19/95	1/26/95		E														Lincoln State Communication Co			-							
	W.E.S Collection	14	1/30/95	1/30/95		¦∢														-								-		
	Documentation/Reporting	18ed	1/16/95	2/3/95		B														-								The same of the sa		

^{*} Deliverable due dates will be modified pending test result receipt.


Figure D - 1
FY 1995: Bench-Scale Treatability Study
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia



^{*} Deliverable due dates will be modified pending test result receipt.

Figure D - 2


FY 1995: Site 12 Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study/Proposed Plan/Record of Decision
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia



. . .

Figure D - 2

FY 1995: Site 12 Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study/Proposed Plan/Record of Decision
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia



#

Figure D - 3

FY 1995: Sites 6 and 7 Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study/Proposed Plan/Record of Decision
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia




Figure D - 3


FY 1995: Sites 6 and 7 Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study/Proposed Plan/Record of Decision
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

				19	95				Т					19	96					T	****				1997					\top					199	8	_	
Task	Days	Start	Finish	-		A S	0	N	D .	j	F N	1 A	М			Α	S	0 1	V D	J	F	М	Α			Α	S	0	N	D J	F	М	Α	М	J.	1 /	4	_
Final	30ed	5/21/97	6/20/97																						3													
PROPOSED PLAN	384ed	6/21/96	7/10/97				1			-																					i					1		
Preliminary Draft	70ed	6/21/96	8/30/96											8		****								i					:							:		
Review (Navy)	31ed	8/30/96	9/30/96													0																						
Draft	133ed	9/30/96	2/10/97	1													8				***		to laboratori en															
Review (EPA/State)	60ed	2/10/97	4/11/97							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100				шщ	ם															
Draft Final	29ed	4/11/97	5/10/97	1			-			-														9														
Review (EPA/State)	31ed	5/10/97	6/10/97							THE PROPERTY OF STATE		-						-		-				<u> </u>												1		
Final	30ed	6/10/97	7/10/97									the rate through an	-										to the first of the second		***													
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD	45ed	7/10/97	8/24/97			-				***************************************		***************************************	mer toda bernai ribera bildire										1															
RECORD OF DECISION	243ed	5/9/97	1/7/98														-							4														
Preliminary Draft	31ed	5/9/97	6/9/97							***************************************		***************************************																										
Review (Navy)	30ed	6/9/97	7/9/97				-			-														0	ш													
Draft	30ed	7/9/97	8/8/97																						8	3									The same of the sa			
Review (EPA/State)	60ed	8/8/97	10/7/97																		***************************************					our	Ш	ם									-	
Draft Final	30ed	10/7/97	11/6/97				-					-																	1									
Review (EPA/State)	32ed	11/6/97	12/8/97										-					Man contract days											<u>am</u>							*		
Final	30ed	12/8/97	1/7/98	1							1						İ							-										-				

Figure D - 4

FY 1995: Sites 1 and 3 Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia



^{*} Final ROD delayed due to funding for Remedial Action (construction).

Figure D - 4

FY 1995: Sites 1 and 3 Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia


ſ	T		
Task	Days	Start	Finish
FEASIBILITY STUDY AND PRAP	334ed	4/28/96	3/28/97
Preliminary Draft Meeting	62ed	4/28/96	6/29/96
Draft	32ed	6/29/96	7/31/96
Review (EPA/State)	149ed	7/31/96	12/27/96
Draft Final	31ed	12/27/96	1/27/97
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	1/27/97	2/26/97
Final	30ed	2/26/97	3/28/97
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD	46ed	3/28/97	5/13/97
RECORD OF DECISION	1185ed	6/29/96	9/27/99
Preliminary Draft Meeting	61ed	6/29/96	8/29/96
Draft	181ed	8/29/96	2/26/97
Review (EPA/State)	61ed	2/26/97	4/28/97
Draft Final	30ed	4/28/97	5/28/97
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	5/28/97	6/27/97
Final*	52ed	8/6/99	9/27/99

^{*} Final ROD delayed due to funding for Remedial Action (construction).

Figure D - 5

FY 1995: Sites 9 and 19 Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study/Proposed Plan/Record of Decision

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia



NOTE: Public Comment Period will close prior to finalization of the Record of Decision.

Figure D - 5

FY 1995: Sites 9 and 19 Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study/Proposed Plan/Record of Decision
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

	1		1	1												·							~=					-			.,	
Task	Days	Start	Finish	0	N		ī	F	M		M	19	96 1	Δ	S	0 1	l D		FN	ΛΔ	M	19	97 T	Δ	S	0	N D		4	J F	I F M	J F M A
Review (EPA/State)	299ed	7/5/96	4/30/97			T			141	7	171		<u>.</u>			T		T						**		Ŭ			Ť			
Draft Final	30ed	4/30/97	5/30/97																	:		2					:					
Review (EPA/State)	31ed	5/30/97	6/30/97							1													:									
Final	30ed	6/30/97	7/30/97					1		!												ę										
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD	47ed	7/30/97	9/15/97														4						į									
RECORD OF DECISION	213ed	5/30/97	12/29/97														A section of the section of			1									l			
Preliminary Draft	31ed	5/30/97	6/30/97														-			:												
Review (Navy)	30ed	6/30/97	7/30/97																		:		шш									
Draft	30ed	7/30/97	8/29/97								1				1					:	:		8									
Review (EPA/State)	31ed	8/29/97	9/29/97												and the second	1					İ			(шш							
Draft Final	30ed	9/29/97	10/29/97	A STATE OF THE STA					***************************************	***************************************															8							
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	10/29/97	11/28/97					-		100 100 100 100																						
Final	31ed	11/28/97	12/29/97							The Part land					-													8	3	3	3	3

NOTE: Public Comment Period will close prior to finalization of the Record of Decision.

APPENDIX E DETAILED SCHEDULES: FY 1996 NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Figure E - 1

FY 1996: Site Screening Areas 8, 11, 12, and 13, Work Plan/SSP Report
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

				-	995												96								·····	
Task	Days	Start	Finish	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apı
SITE SCREENING AREAS 8, 11, 12, and 13	514ed	11/3/95	3/31/97																							3
Site Visit	2ed	11/13/95	11/15/95		!			4		4444																
SSA WORK PLAN	163ed	11/15/95	4/26/96				-												and the same of th							
Draft	30ed	11/15/95	12/15/95		-			VPT-1-40		****		-						!								
Review (EPA/State)	70ed	12/15/95	2/23/96		The state of the s						1111111111	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	7										į			
Draft Final	32ed	2/23/96	3/26/96			market black back back back back back back back b								***************************************						-						
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	3/26/96	4/25/96		-			-				-				1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1				HI	-					
Final	led	4/25/96	4/26/96										•	1												
SSP FIELD INVESTIGATION	4ed	5/6/96	5/10/96											•												
Mobilization	2ed	5/6/96	5/8/96		1						:				1											and the special section of the secti
Field Investigation	2ed	5/8/96	5/10/96		The state of the s																					
SAMPLE ANALYSIS/VALIDATION	54ed	5/8/96	7/1/96			A 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1																				
Sample Analysis	34ed	5/8/96	6/11/96											•												
Data Validation	20ed	6/11/96	7/1/96										1						1							
SITE SCREENING PROCESS REPORT	287ed	6/17/96	3/31/97																							
Draft	45ed	6/17/96	8/1/96							ł							*********									
Review (EPA/State)	151ed	8/1/96	12/30/96											THE STREET	,	5000				mmmn	1111111111111	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				
Draft Final	30ed	12/30/96	1/29/97									and the second	***************************************		4		i					ł				
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	1/29/97	2/28/97									-	H, Mara Metalogy at				11 (amount despression of the				A Page A Control of the Control of t	ٱ		******		
Final	31ed	2/28/97	3/31/97										. [ĺ	1		10 Marin			ĺ				

. 1

Figure E - 2

FY 1996: Sites 11 and 17, Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

							306								997									998								10	99	
Task	Days	Start	Finish	F M	A 1		96 I	2 4	0 N	ם ו	J	F A	ĪΔ				s c) N		Į F	м	A				s c	N C	D D	J F	М	ΑN			A S
SITES 11 and 17	1237ed	2/23/96	7/14/99			******	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1 5								<u> </u>		T			****		7000					Ĺ						Ť
WORK PLAN	273ed	2/23/96	11/22/96							1	000000									*****					22222								224	
Preliminary Draft	60ed	2/23/96	4/23/96		2													-											ny aproduction common and the common					
Review (Navy)	30ed	4/23/96	5/23/96			ם											and the state of t																	
Draft	30ed	5/23/96	6/22/96									-		***************************************									- 1998 - Annie paper van 1	1			*					777		
Review (EPA/State)	60ed	6/22/96	8/21/96					ם						1	-							11.00							***					
Draft Final	30ed	8/21/96	9/20/96														all i sections, passenters	-																
Review (EPA/State)	33ed	9/20/96	10/23/96					۵	III																									
Final	30ed	10/23/96	11/22/96															***************************************	***************************************				***************************************											
RI FIELD INVESTIGATION	44ed	10/7/96	11/20/96			-																							A 144 MAY 144 MAY 144	***************************************				
Mobilization	4ed	10/7/96	10/11/96						1						***************************************			***************************************											***************************************			-		
Field Investigation	23ed	10/28/96	11/20/96			-									-															7	-			
SAMPLE ANALYSIS/VALIDATION	72ed	10/29/96	1/9/97																										an					
Sample Analysis	57ed	10/29/96	12/25/96																										and the second s					-
Data Validation	40ed	11/30/96	1/9/97			MAN I PARTILL MINANCIPART					8	***************************************		***************************************			***************************************																	
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT	313ed	1/9/97	11/18/97						-			lack																						
Preliminary Draft	100ed	1/9/97	4/19/97										***				4												4					
Review (Navy)	31ed	4/19/97	5/20/97								-																		reservables madesters o			Transference (Table)		
Draft	30ed	5/20/97	6/19/97										***************************************		I					***************************************									**		***************************************	***************************************		
Review (EPA/State)	61ed	6/19/97	8/19/97	***************************************											фш																			
Draft Final	30ed	8/19/97	9/18/97						-			-			-		a	***************************************					Marie and Language and	100000000000000000000000000000000000000										-

Note: Public Comment Period will close prior to finalization of the Record of Decision.

Figure E - 2

FY 1996: Sites 11 and 17, Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

							199	26				1		<u></u>	19	97					· · · · · ·	<u> محدث.</u>	<u></u>	1998							199	99	
Task	Days	Start	Finish	F	M A	М	193		S	0 1	N D	l	F M	A	M J		A S	0	ΝI	J	F	M A	Μ.	i j	Α 5	0	N D	J F	M	A M			S
Review (EPA/State)	30cd	9/18/97	10/18/97				Ī					Ī				1				T													
Final	31ed	10/18/97	11/18/97										To a de la company de la compa					8	223					71.1									
FEASIBILITY STUDY	272ed	9/18/97	6/17/98					İ						***************************************						+				1									
Preliminary Draft	60ed	9/18/97	11/17/97						-								8		33									17					
Review (Navy)	30ed	11/17/97	12/17/97																<u> </u>														
Draft	30ed	12/17/97	1/16/98																										The second second				
Review (EPA/State)	60ed	1/16/98	3/17/98	1									-			NAMES OF PERSONS ASSESSED.						1	***************************************			-			Maria and American				
Draft Final	30ed	3/17/98	4/16/98									-	4											-									
Review (EPA/State)	32ed	4/16/98	5/18/98																			П	000										
Final	30ed	5/18/98	6/17/98	1																				1									
PROPOSED PLAN	272ed	4/16/98	1/13/99	1								1				-	-																
Preliminary Draft	60ed	4/16/98	6/15/98	1	1												-				***************************************	Ø		1									ļ
Review (Navy)	30ed	6/15/98	7/15/98													and the second second	***************************************																
Draft	30ed	7/15/98	8/14/98										***************************************				The state of the s							8	2								
Review (EPA/State)	60ed	8/14/98	10/13/98	1	-								Add to the second secon		***************************************																		
Draft Final	30ed	10/13/98	11/12/98																							*	X						
Review (EPA/State)	32ed	11/12/98	12/14/98		1												-																
Final	30ed	12/14/98	1/13/99														-										■	3	-				
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD	47ed	1/13/99	3/1/99													tales in the same of the same	,				***************************************						77.141.141.141						
RECORD OF DECISION	244ed	11/12/98	7/14/99	1																	***************************************									+		•	
Preliminary Draft	32ed	11/12/98	12/14/98	1																											Charles but independs		

Figure E - 2

FY 1996: Sites 11 and 17, Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

				1			199	96				Т				1:	997					T				1	998									199)9	
Task	Days	Start	Finish	F	M A	M	J	J	A S	0	N I	D J	F	M	A	M J	J	A	S (1 C	D	J	F	M	A l	M J	J	A	S	0 1	I D	J	F M	í A	M	J	J A	S
Review (Navy)	30ed	12/14/98	1/13/99																												Ш	נכ						
Draft	30ed	1/13/99	2/12/99						marketa core de c						hardway blanch ship a sa																							
Review (EPA/State)	60cd	2/12/99	4/13/99																															Щ			440	
Draft Final	30ed	4/13/99	5/13/99					-																								Andre de de la constante		Ø	33			
Review (EPA/State)	32ed	5/13/99	6/14/99	Participant of the Control of the Co				The state of the s																								1			ш	מ		
Final	30ed	6/14/99	7/14/99										-																								a	

Note: Public Comment Period will close prior to finalization of the Record of Decision.

Figure E - 3

FY 1996: Sites 4, 21, and 22, Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

	1	·	<u>-</u> -			1	996			T		1	997	·		Т		19	998		<u>_</u>	T		1	999	, -/					20	000			Т
Task	Days	Start	Finish	J	М			S	N	J	М			S	N	J	М	M		S	N	J	M				3	N	J	M	M		S	N	J
SITES 4, 21, and 22	1680ed	2/23/96	9/29/00				T																										223		
WORK PLAN	273ed	2/23/96	11/22/96				ļ	ļ				-												İ											
Preliminary Draft	61ed	2/23/96	4/24/96																				***************************************												
Review (Navy)	30ed	4/24/96	5/24/96			<u></u>	-		1										***************************************												-				
Draft	27ed	5/24/96	6/20/96			**	1	-																											
Review (EPA/State)	81ed	6/20/96	9/9/96				фш	ф							Metal constants																1				
Draft Final	14ed	9/9/96	9/23/96					2									-	I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I																	
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	9/23/96	10/23/96		-			ш																											
Final	30ed	10/23/96	11/22/96																				1												
RI FIELD INVESTIGATION	44ed	10/7/96	11/20/96											-			-																		
Mobilization	4ed	10/7/96	10/11/96					ı			A SAME AND A SAME AND ASSESSED.							-																	
Field Investigation	23ed	10/28/96	11/20/96						⊠		West of the second		***************************************								to produce the control of the contro					!									
SAMPLE ANALYSIS/VALIDATION	72ed	10/29/96	1/9/97							ļ		-	***************************************													:									
Sample Analysis	57ed	10/29/96	12/25/96		***************************************					a			1	***************************************				-																	
Data Validation	40ed	11/30/96	1/9/97						S					i				Market Ma																-	
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT	291ed	1/9/97	10/27/97							-					i			***************************************																	
Preliminary Draft	78ed	1/9/97	3/28/97							888									The second second															1	
Review (Navy)	31ed	3/28/97	4/28/97					-			m	0	***																					t minimit more	
Draft	30ed	4/28/97	5/28/97																THE HAMPING							1									
Review (EPA/State)	61ed	5/28/97	7/28/97																					The state of the s									-		
Draft Final	30ed	7/28/97	8/27/97					1					2	3																					

^{*} Final ROD delayed due to funding for Remedial Action (construction). NOTE: Public Comment Period will close prior to finalization of the Record of Decision.

Figure E - 3

FY 1996: Sites 4, 21, and 22, Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			19	96			<u> </u>		19	97					19	98					19	99			Γ			000			J
Task	Days	Start	Finish	J	M		J	S	N	J	M		J	S	N	J	M	M		S	N	J	M	М		S	N	J	М	М		S	N	J
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	8/27/97	9/26/97											m																				
Final	31ed	9/26/97	10/27/97											888																				
FEASIBILITY STUDY	275ed	8/27/97	5/29/98		100				***************************************																									
Preliminary Draft	61ed	8/27/97	10/27/97																															
Review (Navy)	30ed	10/27/97	11/26/97												m				-							-								
Draft	30ed	11/26/97	12/26/97																-															
Review (EPA/State)	63ed	12/26/97	2/27/98													111111																		
Draft Final	31ed	2/27/98	3/30/98														**																	
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	3/30/98	4/29/98											-							and the second s		and the control of th											
Final	30ed	4/29/98	5/29/98								-			control and the second						****	***************************************			1	-									
PROPOSED PLAN	273ed	3/30/98	12/28/98				-							-									The second secon									The second second		
Preliminary Draft	60ed	3/30/98	5/29/98					-				711111111111111111111111111111111111111																						
Review (Navy)	31ed	5/29/98	6/29/98				Mary Commence of the Commence	-																							COLUMN CO			
Draft	30ed	6/29/98	7/29/98																**															
Review (EPA/State)	61ed	7/29/98	9/28/98					a de la constanta de la consta									-		а															
Draft Final	30ed	9/28/98	10/28/98																	**														
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	10/28/98	11/27/98																	***************************************	<u></u>													
Final	31ed	11/27/98	12/28/98																							1						and the second		
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD	46ed	12/28/98	2/12/99	,																														
RECORD OF DECISION	702ed	10/28/98	9/29/00															•	-															
Preliminary Draft	30ed	10/28/98	11/27/98																													Maria Caracana de Maria Caraca		

^{*} Final ROD delayed due to funding for Remedial Action (construction). NOTE: Public Comment Period will close prior to finalization of the Record of Decision.

Figure E - 3

FY 1996: Sites 4, 21, and 22, Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

						19	996					19	97					19	98					19	99					20	000			
Task	Days	Start	Finish	J	M	M	J	S	N	J	M	M	J	S	N	J	M	M	J	S	N	J	М	M	J	S	N	J	M	M	J	S	N	J
Review (Navy)	31ed	11/27/98	12/28/98								***************************************										ш									The state of the s				
Draft	30ed	12/28/98	1/27/99																		B	23												
Review (EPA/State)	61ed	1/27/99	3/29/99																			an	0								***************************************			
Draft Final	30ed	3/29/99	4/28/99				-				***************************************								-			-												
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	4/28/99	5/28/99								11.1.1												q	W .										
Final*	56ed	8/4/00	9/29/00														-										1				S			

^{*} Final ROD delayed due to funding for Remedial Action (construction). NOTE: Public Comment Period will close prior to finalization of the Record of Decision.

Figure E - 4

FY 1996: Sites 2, 8, 18 and SSA 14 Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia




Figure E - 4

FY 1996: Sites 2, 8, 18 and SSA 14 Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

			<u> </u>	1	1996					Т				199	7	-			Т		-		19	98					T				1	999							
Task	Days	Start	Finish	M.		_A	S	0 1	N D	J	F N	M A	M	J.	J A	S	0	N I) J	F	M A	M	J	J	A S	s c	N	1 D	J	F	М	A l	M J	J	A	S	0	N	D	J	F
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	11/17/97	12/17/97															ш																							
Final	30ed	12/17/97	1/16/98					4																						1											
FEASIBILITY STUDY	273ed	11/17/97	8/17/98																																						
Preliminary Draft	60ed	11/17/97	1/16/98																																						
Review (Navy)	31ed	1/16/98	2/16/98															AMPLICATION OF THE PARTY.																							
Draft	30ed	2/16/98	3/18/98																		2					-															
Review (EPA/State)	61ed	3/18/98	5/18/98																		ш	ш	4,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,																		
Draft Final	30ed	5/18/98	6/17/98																			8	***										and the second second								
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	6/17/98	7/17/98															Trieder Internation					0				-						-								
Final	31ed	7/17/98	8/17/98						-						-										8	;		Andrew markets													
PROPOSED PLAN	273ed	6/17/98	3/17/99															-										_	<u> </u>												
Preliminary Draft	61ed	6/17/98	8/17/98		-						-				-								8		8										THE REST OF THE PARTY OF THE PA						
Review (Navy)	30ed	8/17/98	9/16/98					-			***************************************							-							ш	3		1													
Draft	30ed	9/16/98	10/16/98																																						
Review (EPA/State)	60ed	10/16/98	12/15/98					-							-											C	ЩП	ш													
Draft Final	30ed	12/15/98	1/14/99																ŀ		The state of the s							E													
Review (EPA/State)	32ed	1/14/99	2/15/99															Parent bed o bred bredening								1		Si atau atau angan		m											
Final	30ed	2/15/99	3/17/99											months of the concessor	-											-		topa con apparent		æ	3										
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD	47ed	3/17/99	5/3/99				-								-											-		***************************************													
RECORD OF DECISION	243ed	1/14/99	9/14/99												-													Marity Company Com										-		***************************************	
Preliminary Draft	32ed	1/14/99	2/15/99				***************************************	- Mannager						***************************************	***************************************			***************************************												3											

Note: Public Comment Period will close prior to finalization of the Record of Decision.

Figure E - 4

FY 1996: Sites 2, 8, 18 and SSA 14 Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

				1	996					<u> </u>				1997	,				T					199	3									199	99					I	
Task	Days	Start	Finish	M J	J	Α	S	0 1	4 D	j	F M	1 A	М	J J	Α	S	0	N D) J	F	М	Α	М.	J J	A	S	0	N	D	J 1	M	Α	M	J	J.	A S	S C	N	D	J	F
Review (Navy)	30ed	2/15/99	3/17/99								4.000.000																				ш							100			
Draft	30ed	3/17/99	4/16/99							Name and annual to	-												1									772								ľ	
Review (EPA/State)	60ed	4/16/99	6/15/99											:			1					:			i						1	П	ш				i	i	1		
Draft Final	30ed	6/15/99	7/15/99								-							-																**	2						
Review (EPA/State)	32ed	7/15/99	8/16/99							and the contract of the contra	The same of the same of													1											ш	0					
Final	29ed	8/16/99	9/14/99																														Annual Annual		-						

Note: Public Comment Period will close prior to finalization of the Record of Decision.

Figure E - 5
FY 1996: Site 12, Remedial Design
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

				1996												1997				
Task	Days	Start	Finish	J J	A	S	0	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	0	N
REMEDIAL DESIGN	240cd	8/14/96	4/11/97		1															
Draft	75ed	8/14/96	10/28/96	-	2			2												
Review (Navy/EPA/State)	59ed	10/28/96	12/26/96		W. 1 (100 May 1 (ajmumu						:						
Pre-Final	32ed	12/26/96	1/27/97		To the second se	1940	***************************************				rate and control a									
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	1/27/97	2/26/97			And the second		1												
Final	30ed	2/26/97	3/28/97										3							
Review (EPA/State)	14ed	3/28/97	4/11/97	March 11 House	esservite estate estate estate estate estate estate estate estate estate estate estate estate estate estate es	And the Control of th														
CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTING	60ed	4/11/97	6/10/97	1 · 1 · 1 · 1 · 1 · 1 · 1 · 1 · 1 · 1 ·	An anno agen aga agen	400			allers all to consider the											

APPENDIX F DETAILED SCHEDULES: FY 1997 NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Figure F - 1

FY 1997: Sites 23, 24, 25, 26 Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia




Figure F - 1

FY 1997: Sites 23, 24, 25, 26 Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

	<u> </u>			Γ			199	7			\neg				199	8							19	99							20			
Task	Days	Start	Finish	J F	M	Αλ			S	0 1	1 D	J F	M	A M	J	J A	S	0	N D	J	M	A 1	ИJ	J	A S	0	N D	J F	M	A 1	ИJ	J	A S	0
Final	31ed	7/24/98	8/24/98														3						1								***************************************			
FEASIBILITY STUDY	273ed	7/24/98	4/23/99									a man competition of						-			_		1											
Preliminary Draft	61ed	7/24/98	9/23/98											1		6																		
Review (Navy)	30ed	9/23/98	10/23/98													-	C	m																4
Draft	31ed	10/23/98	11/23/98															**	2														and the second second second	
Review (EPA/State)	60ed	11/23/98	1/22/99									and or bath billing common							фш	ш														
Draft Final	31ed	1/22/99	2/22/99									-							1		3						1		ļ					
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	2/22/99	3/24/99											1							ш													
Final	30ed	3/24/99	4/23/99													-										4					:			
PROPOSED PLAN	273ed	3/24/99	12/22/99																		1						<u>:</u>					1		
Preliminary Draft	61ed	3/24/99	5/24/99																1		. 1		3											
Review (Navy)	30ed	5/24/99	6/23/99											-		-																		
Draft	30ed	6/23/99	7/23/99					1				-							:			. :												1
Review (EPA/State)	60ed	7/23/99	9/21/99																					Ш	11111111								1	
Draft Final	30ed	9/21/99	10/21/99																:			, :											:	
Review (EPA/State)	32ed	10/21/99	11/22/99			1	***************************************									Principle of the second										. 0			1				:	
Final	30ed	11/22/99	12/22/99																			1 .									ı			
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD	45ed	12/22/99	2/5/00																															

)

Figure F - 1

FY 1997: Sites 23, 24, 25, 26 Work Plan/Field Investigation/RI Report/FS Report/PRAP/ROD

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

								199	7				\Box					199	8								_	1	999					T					200	00				
Task	Days	Start	Finish	J I	· M	Α	M	J J	ΙΛ	S	O	N	D.	J	M	A	M	J	J /	S	0	N	D	J	F	M.	A N	ИJ	J	A	S	0	N D) J	F	M	A	M	J	J.	A	S	0	N
RECORD OF DECISION	273ed	11/22/99	8/21/00	-				-																		-																		
Preliminary Draft	60ed	11/22/99	1/21/00		1		:		1	1								1			1				1			:		1		1							1			4 4 - 14 4 4 4		
Review (Navy)	31ed	1/21/00	2/21/00																		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				-			1				1									1			
Draft	30ed	2/21/00	3/22/00		i		Total Section 1		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,																	:						1			ŧ	***				:				
Review (EPA/State)	61ed	3/22/00	5/22/00															-	The state of the s																		100	ID .		:			Total Control allows	
Draft Final	30ed	5/22/00	6/21/00																										-			-	:						₩.			- The second second		
Review (EPA/State)	30ed	6/21/00	7/21/00			***************************************		***************************************						***************************************		***************************************			744	-						-													Ш					
Final	31ed	7/21/00	8/21/00				-		ĺ							*			-																						3	-		

Figure F - 2
FY 1997: SSAs 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 Work Plan/Field Investigation/SSP Report
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia




Figure F - 2
FY 1997: SSAs 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 Work Plan/Field Investigation/SSP Report
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

		<u> </u>		η						1997						Γ						1998				
Task	Days	Start	Finish	J	F	М	A	M	J	J	Α	S	0	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	1	J	<u>A</u>	S	0	N
Review (EPA/State)	60ed	4/24/98	6/23/98		i	1															пішш]				
Draft Final	30ed	6/23/98	7/23/98																							
Review (EPA/State)	32ed	7/23/98	8/24/98										10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	4								1	ЩШ	1		-
Final	30ed	8/24/98	9/23/98																	į					1	

APPENDIX G SUMMARY SCHEDULES: FY 1998 AND BEYOND NAVAL WEAPONS STATION YORKTOWN, YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

Figure G - 1
FY 1998: Site 9 and 19, Remedial Design
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

				T			Т			_			1998	3					Т					199	99					T					200	00			
Task	Days	Start	Finish	S	0	N	D	J	F N	M	A 1	м.	J J	A	S	0	N	Ď	J	F	М	A	M	J	J	A	S	0 1	V 1	D .	J F	M	Α	M	J	J	A	S	의
REMEDIAL DESIGN	322ed	11/3/97	9/21/98	Γ								4																											
Draft *	63ed	11/3/97	1/5/98							ĺ			-				1							***************************************															
Review (Navy/EPA/State)	60ed	1/5/98	3/6/98					ann		-																		The same was the same of											
Pre-Final	60ed	3/6/98	5/5/98						8				-												-									-					
Review (EPA/State)	62ed	5/5/98	7/6/98				ļ	-		40.000.000	٥															-	***************************************		***************************************										
Final	60ed	7/6/98	9/4/98										88											1			4												
Review (EPA/State)	17ed	9/4/98	9/21/98	1				-							m									A STATE OF THE STA															
CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTING	60ed	9/21/98	11/20/98																							-													


^{*} Note: Assumes minimal design because of Army Corps of Engineers, WES involvement

Figure G - 2
FY 1998: Sites 1 and 3 Remedial Design
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

								199	7					Г					1998											1999)					<u> </u>	
Task	Days	Start	Finish	J I	M	Α	M	J .	J Z	A S	0	N	D	j	F	M	A	М.	1	A	S	0	N	D	J	F	М	A	Μ.	J	A	S	0	N	D	J	F
REMEDIAL DESIGN	319ed	12/27/97	11/11/98																4	-	+	<u></u>															
Draft	60ed	12/27/97	2/25/98																	The state of the s																	
Review (Navy/EPA/State)	62ed	2/25/98	4/28/98									-	_		C	пш				-			-							1		Total British	-				
Pre-Final	60ed	4/28/98	6/27/98						1								8		***											Mary and the same of the same							
Review (EPA/State)	60ed	6/27/98	8/26/98																din	щш]														-		
Final	62ed	8/26/98	10/27/98	-								and the same of th					-																		i.		
Review (EPA/State)	15ed	10/27/98	11/11/98	-								-					B100 B100 C ARCO MI				***************************************		ш							A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR					4		
CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTING	60ed	11/11/99	1/10/00	-		-					-																								4	-	

....

Figure G - 3
FY 1999: Sites 4, 21, and 22, Remedial Design
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia



....

Figure G - 4

FY 1999: Sites 11 and 17, Remedial Design
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

			-						1	999						T						200	0											2	2001	
Task	Days	Start	Finish	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Α	S	0	N	D	J	F	M	Α	N	IJ		J	A	S	0	N	D	J	F	M	<u>A</u>	M	J		A
REMEDIAL DESIGN	407ed	5/17/99	6/27/00					-	<u> </u>	-	 	4	 	-		-	+	4-		-													1			
Draft	150ed	5/17/99	10/14/99					■																												
Review (Navy/EPA/State)	60ed	10/14/99	12/13/99										O	прии				4																		
Pre-Final	60ed	12/13/99	2/11/00								***********			***************************************	S		***																			
Review (EPA/State)	60ed	2/11/00	4/11/00							-							0	пфш	m																	i
Final	62ed	4/11/00	6/12/00										-						8	****		1														
Review (EPA/State)	15ed	6/12/00	6/27/00															-				m														
CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTING	62ed	6/27/00	8/28/00										-																							

Figure G - 5

FY 1999: Site 2, Remedial Design

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

	Γ			Γ			19	999												2	000						1					2	001			
Task	Days	Start	Finish	М	A	M	J	J	Α		s (0 1	N	D	J	F	М	A	M	J	J	A	S	0	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	1
REMEDIAL DESIGN	410ed	7/15/99	8/28/00					=	-	+	_								<u> </u>	<u> </u>	+	-										1				
Draft	151ed	7/15/99	12/13/99											222						***************************************								-								
Review (Navy/EPA/State)	60ed	12/13/99	2/11/00								And the control of th				шш	II							1													
Pre-Final	60ed	2/11/00	4/11/00																			M			-					4						
Review (EPA/State)	62ed	4/11/00	6/12/00															Ш	фии	ш	***************************************										at the same of the					
Final	60ed	6/12/00	8/11/00							-																										
Review (EPA/State)	17ed	8/11/00	8/28/00					Southern legal and a special														П	0													
CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTING	60ed	8/28/00	10/27/00	1					-									-								-										

192

Figure G - 6
FY 1999: Sites 8 and 18, Remedial Design
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

